THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

No. 16.] APRIL, 1803. [No. 4. Vol. II.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTER OF IGNATIUS TO THE CHURCH AT MAGNESIA BESIDE THE MAEANDER.

IGNATIUS, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church which is at Magnesia beside the Mæander,* wisheth salvation in God our Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ.

When I had learned the abundance of your charity according to God, I had great joy, and determined to address you in the faith of Jesus Christ. For having been accounted worthy of that name,† which bears in it the appellation of the divine majesty; in this chain which binds my body I severally commend the Churches, for whom I earnestly wish an union both of flesh and spirit with Jesus Christ our everlasting life, an union of faith and love towards Christ and the Father, in whom, after having sustained the assaults of the prince of this world and overcome, we shall finally enjoy God.

Since, therefore, I have been accounted worthy to behold you in the person of Damas your bishop, of the presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and my fellow servant Sotion the deacon, who is obedient to the bishop as to the grace of God, and to the Presbyters as to the Apostles, I entreat you, brethren, not to despise the youth of your pastor,‡ but reverence his person according to the divine authority which belongs to his office, as I know the holy presbyters already do, not regarding his want of age, but submitting themselves as wise men unto him, or rather indeed to the Father of Jesus Christ the universal bishop. You are bound, therefore, to obey, in honour of him who requires obedience at your hand, without hypocrisy: for it is not enough that we be Christians in name but in deed, neither is it enough to name the name of a bishop, and to do every thing without his concurrence. Such persons have made shipwreck of conscience, because they assemble together against the commandment. Beloved, all things draw to an end: life and death are before us, and every one shall go to his own place; for as two pieces of coin bear different impressions, so also believers and unbelievers have different characters impressed upon them, the one of God, the other of the world. Since, therefore, in the persons of your ministers I have conversed with your whole assembly, I exhort you to study to do every thing in a spirit of divine harmony, the bishop presiding in the place of God, the presbyters in that of the apostolical college, and lastly, the deacons, to whom is committed the ministry§ of Christ, who was with the Father before the world began, and hath now appeared in the fulness of time. Imitating, therefore, the divine temper which was in him, yield due reverence one to another, none regarding his brother according to the flesh, but loving one another in Christ.

As therefore the Lord Jesus did nothing without the Father, (being one with him) either in his own person or by the Apostles, as also do ye: meeting together in one place, let there be among you one prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope in charity and joy unreproved. Be ye all united as in the same temple, before the same altar, through the same Jesus Christ, who coming from the same Father exists in, and returns to, the same. Be not seduced by strange doctrines nor old

* So called to distinguish it from Magnesia on Mount Sipylus.

† Theophorus.

‡ The word pastor is rarely applied in the writings of the Fathers to any but bishops.

§ *διακονιαν*—we have no single word which will convey this appropriate meaning.

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

No. 16.] APRIL, 1803. [No. 4. Vol. II.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTER OF IGNATIUS TO THE CHURCH AT MAGNESIA BESIDE THE MAEANDER.

IGNATIUS, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church which is at Magnesia beside the Mæander,* wisheth salvation in God our Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ.

When I had learned the abundance of your charity according to God, I had great joy, and determined to address you in the faith of Jesus Christ. For having been accounted worthy of that name,† which bears in it the appellation of the divine majesty; in this chain which binds my body I severally commend the Churches, for whom I earnestly wish an union both of flesh and spirit with Jesus Christ our everlasting life, an union of faith and love towards Christ and the Father, in whom, after having sustained the assaults of the prince of this world and overcome, we shall finally enjoy God.

Since, therefore, I have been accounted worthy to behold you in the person of Damas your bishop, of the presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and my fellow servant Sotion the deacon, who is obedient to the bishop as to the grace of God, and to the Presbyters as to the Apostles, I entreat you, brethren, not to despise the youth of your pastor,‡ but reverence his person according to the divine authority which belongs to his office, as I know the holy presbyters already do, not regarding his want of age, but submitting themselves as wise men unto him, or rather indeed to the Father of Jesus Christ the universal bishop. You are bound, therefore, to obey, in honour of him who requires obedience at your hand, without hypocrisy: for it is not enough that we be Christians in name but in deed, neither is it enough to name the name of a bishop, and to do every thing without his concurrence. Such persons have made shipwreck of conscience, because they assemble together against the commandment. Beloved, all things draw to an end: life and death are before us, and every one shall go to his own place; for as two pieces of coin bear different impressions, so also believers and unbelievers have different characters impressed upon them, the one of God, the other of the world. Since, therefore, in the persons of your ministers I have conversed with your whole assembly, I exhort you to study to do every thing in a spirit of divine harmony, the bishop presiding in the place of God, the presbyters in that of the apostolical college, and lastly, the deacons, to whom is committed the ministry§ of Christ, who was with the Father before the world began, and hath now appeared in the fulness of time. Imitating, therefore, the divine temper which was in him, yield due reverence one to another, none regarding his brother according to the flesh, but loving one another in Christ.

As therefore the Lord Jesus did nothing without the Father, (being one with him) either in his own person or by the Apostles, as also do ye: meeting together in one place, let there be among you one prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope in charity and joy unreproved. Be ye all united as in the same temple, before the same altar, through the same Jesus Christ, who coming from the same Father exists in, and returns to, the same. Be not seduced by strange doctrines nor old

* So called to distinguish it from Magnesia on Mount Sipylus.

† Theophorus.

‡ The word pastor is rarely applied in the writings of the Fathers to any but bishops.

§ *διακονιαν*—we have no single word which will convey this appropriate meaning.

and useless fables; for if we shall continue to live according to the law of Moses, we thereby acknowledge that we have not received grace; for even the inspired prophets of old lived according to Christ: for this cause they suffered persecution, in order to convince unbelievers that one God manifested himself by Jesus Christ his Son, who is the eternal word of the Father, *not proceeding but of silence*,* and in whom the Father is well pleased. If, therefore, they who lived under the old dispensation attained to the hope of the new, let us no longer observe the sabbath, but sanctify the Lord's Day; in which our life arose out of him and his death, through which mystery we have received faith, and for which we endure persecution through Jesus Christ the only teacher.

And if the prophets themselves were his disciples, if they waited for him as their teacher in the spirit, and if he, to whom they looked forward, hath by his coming raised them from the dead,† how should we live when separated from him? Let us not, therefore, be insensible of his goodness; for if he should follow our example,‡ we should be undone for ever. Since therefore we have professed ourselves his disciples, let us walk according to his law: work off, therefore, the old and sour leaven, and be changed into the new leaven, which is Christ; be salted in him that ye be not corrupted in yourselves, for every one shall be known by his scent. It is absurd to name the name of Christ, and to Judaize; for Christianity hath not passed away into Judaism but Judaism into Christianity, that every language and people under heaven, by professing faith in Christ, might be gathered to God.

And this I say, brethren, not because I know or suspect that any of you are tinctured with a Judaizing spirit, but as your inferior,§ I am anxious to put you upon your guard lest ye fall into the snares of false doctrines; and above all that ye may be fully assured of the nativity, passion, and resurrection, which things really, and not in appearance‖ only, happened unto the Lord Jesus, from whom God forbid that any one should fall away.

May I receive comfort from you in all things, If I am worthy; for, though bound,¶ I deserve not to be compared to you who are at liberty. I know that in you no pride hath place, because Christ dwelleth in you. So that when I commend you, ye are covered with confusion as it is written—"The righteous accuseth himself."**

Study, however, to be confirmed in the precepts of our Lord and his Apostles, that whatever ye do may prosper, in flesh and spirit, in faith and charity, in the beginning and the end, in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, with your worthy Bishop, with the spiritual crown†† of your Presbytery, and with your godly and faithful Deacons.

I know that ye are filled with God, and have therefore been the more brief in my exhortations. Be mindful of me in your prayers, that I may attain unto God; and of the Church which is in Syria, from which I am not worthy to be called forth to witness the truth; for I want your united supplication and charity. May I be accounted worthy to be bedewed‡‡ by your intercessions. They of Ephesus salute you from Smyrna, whence I now write. Indeed they have greatly refreshed me, together with Polycarp Bishop of the Smyrnæans. The other Churches§§ also

* Silence, one of the errors of the Valentinians, a sect of early heretics, whose fantastic genealogies were exposed by Irenæus.

† This is to be understood by anticipation.

‡ Meaning, probably, in returning evil for evil.

§ The language of excessive humility, however sincere, ought to be avoided, as it may be mistaken for affectation.

‖ Opposed to the heresy of the Docetæ.

¶ Perhaps an oblique hint at the merit of suffering for religion, an opinion too flattering to the pride of the human heart to be long excluded.

** Prov. xviii. 17.

†† I have chosen to preserve the ambiguity of the original, which signifies both an ornamental chaplet for the head, and a circle or ring of men assembled for some particular purpose. In the latter sense, the Latin word *corona* is used by the best writers.

‡‡ This is the original word, which I have been careful to preserve, though it might have been more properly applied to divine grace, descending like the dews of heaven upon the subject of those intercessions.

§§ Whose deputies were present with the writer.

salute you in the reverence of Jesus Christ. Farewell in the peace of God, and enjoy that inseparable spirit which is Christ!

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE presumptuous and daring manner in which Colonel Despard met his fate upon the scaffold has been an affecting subject of reflection to every serious Christian. It affords a melancholy specimen of the way in which infidels die, and except in the case of a very few profligate criminals of the lowest order, has not been a common spectacle in this kingdom. In France, where public executions were lately so very frequent, I have often heard of the indifference, and even gayety which were displayed by many of the victims of the revolution, in their way to the guillotine; but it has not been my lot to meet with any recorded instances (though there may, doubtless, have been some) of true fortitude and composure of mind in that awful hour upon principles truly Christian. I cannot but consider this as an effect of the baneful success of infidelity, and a proof of the general ignorance of vital Christianity in that land. In our own country, the scaffold has often been the scene of Christian edification. The crowds surrounding it have felt the force of religious impressions, their faith has been fortified, and their piety kindled by the tranquillity and resignation of the sufferer, by his affecting prayers, his penitent confessions, and his well-founded hopes of pardon with God. It may be interesting, perhaps, to some of your readers, to lay before them extracts from authentic accounts of the conversation and behaviour of some of our eminent men, who, in former times, perished on the scaffold. I purposely select my examples from the order of nobles, from the class of statesmen or soldiers, that it may appear that dignity of station, and the active occupations of life, have not been found incompatible with Christian duties. It will be interesting also to observe what were the religious doctrines usually held in the good old times, when religion, if not quite so *rational* as in the present refined period, certainly produced much more extensive and important effects. N. D.

THE EARL OF STAFFORD.

On Wednesday, May 12th, 1641, the Earl was brought to the scaffold on Tower hill; as he passed near the lodgings of the Archbishop of Canterbury, (whom he had desired by a message to be at the window, and to bless him as he went to execution) he looked up, and bowing, said, "My Lord, your prayers and your blessing." The Archbishop lifted up his hands for the sign of bestowing both, but was so overcome with grief, that he fell back in a swoon. The Earl bowed again, and said, "Farewell, my Lord; God protect your innocency." Many of the spectators observed, that he walked more like a general at the head of an army than a condemned man. The lieutenant desired him to take coach, for fear the people should rush upon him and tear him to pieces. "No, said he, master lieutenant, I dare look death in the face, and I hope the people too; if that may give them better content, it is all one to me." Upon the scaffold, attended by the Archbishop of Armagh, the Earl of Cleveland, his brother Sir George Wentworth, and his own chaplain, he delivered the following speech with a very composed and courageous air:

"My lord Primate of Ireland, and my Lords, and the rest of these noble Gentlemen: It is a great comfort to me to have your Lordships by me this day, because I have been known to you a long time, and now desire to be heard a few words.

"I come here, my Lords, to pay my last debt to sin, which is death; and through the mercies of God to rise again to eternal glory.

"My Lords, if I may use a few words, I shall take it as a great courtesy from you; I come here to submit to the judgment that is passed against me: I do it with a very quiet and contented mind. I do freely forgive all the world; a forgiveness not from the teeth outward (as they say,) but from my heart. I speak in the presence of Almighty God before whom I stand, that there is not a displeasing thought

that ariseth in me against any man. I thank God, I say truly, my conscience bears me witness, that in all the honour I had to serve his majesty, I had not any intention in my heart, but what did aim at the joint and individual prosperity of the king and his people, although it be my ill-hap to be misconstrued: I am not the first man that hath suffered in this kind: it is a common portion that befals men in this life; righteous judgment shall be hereafter; but we are subject to error, and misjudging one another.

"One thing I desire to be heard in, and do hope, that for Christian charity's sake I shall be believed; I was so far from being against parliaments, that I did always think parliaments in England to be the happy constitution of the kingdom and nation, and the best means, under God, to make the king and his people happy. As for my death, I do here acquit all the world, and beseech God to forgive them. In particular I am very glad his Majesty conceives me not meriting so severe and heavy a punishment, as the utmost execution of this sentence; I do infinitely rejoice in it, and in that mercy of his, and do beseech God, to return him the same, that he may find mercy when he hath most need of it. I wish this kingdom all prosperity and happiness in the world; I did it living, and now dying, it is my wish.

"I profess heartily my apprehension, and do humbly recommend it to you, and wish that every man would lay his hand on his heart, and consider seriously, whether the beginning of the people's happiness should be written *in letters of blood?* I fear they are in a wrong way: I desire Almighty God, that no one drop of my blood rise up in judgment against them. I have but one word more, and that is for my religion.

"My Lord of Armagh, I do profess myself seriously, faithfully, and truly, to be an obedient son of the Church of England: in that Church I was born and bred, in that religion I have lived, and now in that I die; prosperity and happiness be ever to it.

"It hath been said I was inclined to popery: if that be an objection worth the answering, let me say truly from my heart, that since I was twenty-one years of age unto this day, going on forty nine years, I never had thought or doubt of the truth of this religion, nor had ever any the boldness to suggest to me the contrary, to my best remembrance.

"And so being reconciled to the mercies of Jesus Christ my Saviour, into whose bosom I hope shortly to be gathered, to enjoy eternal happiness, which shall never have an end, I desire heartily to be forgiven of every man, if any rash or unadvised words or deeds have passed from me; and desire all your prayers: and so, my Lord, farewell; and farewell all things in this world.

"The Lord strengthen my faith, and give me confidence and assurance in the merits of Christ Jesus: I trust in God, we shall all meet to live eternally in heaven, and receive the accomplishments of all happiness, where every tear shall be wiped from our eyes, and sad thoughts from our hearts; and so God bless this kingdom, and Jesus have mercy on my soul."

After this speech he prayed out of the common prayer-book, laid by his chaplain before him; and then used some private devotions, concluding with the Lord's Prayer: then taking his leave of his brother, he said,—"Brother, we must part: remember me to my sister, and to my wife; and carry my blessing to my eldest son, and charge him from me that he fear God, and continue an obedient son of the Church of England, and that he approve himself a faithful subject of the king; and tell him, that he should not have any private grudge or revenge towards any concerning me; and bid him beware to meddle with Church Livings, for that will prove a moth and canker to him in his estate. I wish him to content himself to be a servant to his country, as a justice of the peace in his county, not aiming at high preferments. Carry my blessing also to my daughters Anne and Arabella, charge them to fear and serve God, and he will bless them, not forgetting my little infant, that neither knows good nor evil, and cannot speak for itself; God speak for it and bless it." Then he said, "I have nigh done: one

stroke will make my wife husbandless, my dear children fatherless, and my poor servants masterless, and separate me from my dear brother and all my friends; but let God be to you and them all in all."

The executioner struck off his head at one blow; and so fell this noble Earl, who, if his master could have saved him, might have been able to save his master. This was, indeed, the blow that by degrees reached up to the King's own head.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I AM pleased to observe, that in your review of Mr. Faber's Horæ Mosaicæ, Vol. I. p. 591, you express disapprobation of Dr. Kennicott's conjectural *emendation* (as it is called) of Isaiah liii. 9; (*and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.*) I cannot but greatly regret that any sound divine should sanction a mode of interpreting (or, may I not rather say, of *misrepresenting*,) the sacred writings, so licentious in its principle, and which may be so mischievous in its operation. Too great caution cannot be used in altering the established text of the Scriptures on the authority of manuscripts and ancient versions; but in this instance the alteration is *merely* conjectural, not being supported by one manuscript or by any translation. Dr. Campbell properly observes, in the dissertation to which you refer, that our present English version of the passage in question is sufficiently intelligible; but yet it seems capable of being improved in perfect consistency with the grammatical construction of the present text, and with the events of which it is an acknowledged prediction, as I shall endeavour to shew in the following remarks.

The original Hebrew is as follows: ויתן את־רשעים קברו ואת־עשיר במתיו "The first verb in this verse should probably," as Dr. Kennicott observes, "be rendered passively, in analogy to the verbs preceding;" and the particle ו, which begins the second clause of this passage, may be translated *but*; that it very frequently has this meaning is well known to Hebrew scholars: במתיו I would render, "*after* his death." This rendering is authorized by Noldius, who, among other passages, cites this which we are considering as one in which the particle ב signifies *after*. (Concord. Partic. Ebr. Chald. p. 151.) במתיו is in the plural number, emphatically, by a poetical figure common to the Hebrew writers and the classical poets. Jeremiah xvi. 4. ממותי תחלאים. Ezek. xxviii 8. ממותי חלל. 10. מותי ערלים. Virg. Æn. x. 854. *Omnes per* mortes *animam sontem ipse dedissem.*

This passage may, therefore, be translated thus—"And his grave was appointed with the wicked, but it was with the rich man after his death;" i. e. it was, before our Lord's death, appointed, or intended by those who crucified him, that he should be buried in the same manner, perhaps in the same place, in which malefactors were commonly buried; (see the quotation from Geier in Mr. Faber's Horæ Mosaicæ, Vol. II. p. 210) but after his death this purpose was frustrated by the providence of God, and he was actually interred in the tomb of a rich man. This prophecy may be farther illustrated by observing, that it was not till *after the death* of our Lord that Joseph of Arimathea applied to Pilate for permission to bury him.

Bishop Lowth renders במתיו *his tomb*; but this sense of the word is not supported by any ancient version, or by any other passage in the Hebrew Scriptures; it is in fact a meaning invented for this particular place, in order to get rid of the supposed difficulty of the common rendering.

As I am upon this subject, I will trouble you with a few observations on some other passages of the Bishop's translation of this chapter.

In verse 6, the Bishop reads עונת instead of עון *(iniquity)* on the authority, as he represents it, of the ancient interpreters, and of the Vulgate in one MS. This affords us an opportunity of exposing the fallacy of the principle on which this celebrated translator, and other modern Hebrew critics, evidently build many of their alterations of the established text, though they do not expressly avow it. It is this—*that the ancient interpreters rendered the Hebrew text* VERBATIM. Without as-

suming this as an axiom, the Bishop could not have proposed this alteration contrary to the authority of manuscripts and editions, than which nothing can be more wanton and frivolous. Who does not perceive that עֲוֹן, like its corresponding term in the English and other languages, is a word of which the singular number has a plural sense, except when expressly limited to a single instance of wickedness, and may therefore be, with equal propriety, rendered *iniquity* or *iniquities*. Accordingly the LXX. frequently translate it ἀδικιαι and ἁμαρτιαι, as they have by the latter word in the following passages of Isaiah, besides that under consideration: i. 4.—v. 18.—vi. 7.—xiii. 11.—xiv. 21.—lix. 3.—lxiv. 8 or 9. In none of these instances has the Bishop proposed to alter the text on the authority of the Greek, though there is equally good reason for doing it as in the present.

Verse 8. For למו *(was he stricken,)* the Bishop reads למות on the authority of the LXX, and the Coptic and Sahidic versions made from it; all of which must therefore be considered as only *one* authority. He supports this alteration by an argument of Dr. Kennicott's, drawn from Origen's quoting this passage as it stands in the LXX, in a disputation with some Jews, to prove that it is a prophecy concerning one individual person; which, says the Doctor, we cannot suppose he would have done "if the Greek version had not agreed here with the Hebrew text; nor that these wise Jews would have been at all distressed by this quotation, unless their Hebrew text had read agreeably to εις θανατον, on which the argument principally depended: for, by quoting it immediately, they would have triumphed over him, and reprobated his Greek version." But the reading of the Greek interpreters may easily and rationally be accounted for, consistently with the present Hebrew text, by supposing that they intended to express what they understood to be the sense of the passage, as they have done in many other instances; and they would learn that the blow, with which the person spoken of was to be smitten, was a mortal blow, from the passage immediately preceding, and from other parts of the prophecy.—Origen might, therefore, safely quote the Greek text against the Jews; for, if they had objected, that there was no mention made of his being put to death in this passage, according to their reading, Origen might have proved it abundantly from the context.

But on referring to the passage in Origen, from which the Doctor quotes, it will appear, that "the argument" did *not* "principally depend" on the reading εις θανατον, as he asserts it did. The Jews could scarcely have denied that the person spoken of was to be put to death in one sense or another; nor does it appear from Origen's account that they did. But they contended that their *nation* was spoken of under the figure of a single person; and to shew the absurdity of this explanation, Origen presses them with this passage, in which it is said, "for the transgression of MY PEOPLE he was smitten;" the stress of the argument depended on the expression *my people;* and from it Origen justly argued, that the prophet speaks of another person besides, and different from, the people of God.* This argument, therefore, proves nothing in favour of the reading למות.

After all, are we certain that Origen, who "must have understood Hebrew," as the Doctor observes, quoted the LXX. in the disputation with these "wise Jews," who, we may be sure, would appeal to and quote their own Scriptures? It seems most probable, that the *Hebrew* Scriptures were referred to by both parties in this disputation, though Origen would naturally quote the LXX. in a Greek treatise.

Verse 10. החלי, "He grievously afflicted *him*," the pronoun being omitted, as is frequently the case in the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly in the

* Μαλιστα δεδοξαμεν θλιβειν απο της φατκστης λεξεως το, Απο των ανομιων τ̃ λα̃ μ̃ ηχθη εις θανατον. ει γαρ ο λαος κατ' εκεινους εισιν οι προφητευομενοι, πως απο των ανομιων τ̃ λα̃ τ̃ Θε̃ λεγεται ηχθαι εις θανατον αυτος, ει μη ετερος ων παρα τον λαον τ̃ Θε̃. —Orig. cont. Cels lib. i. p. 42. ed. Spencer.

poetical parts. For this word, Lowth would read בחלי, on the supposed authority of the Vulgate *only*. Here again he goes on the unfounded assumption noticed above. The form of this verb is vindicated by Buxtorf, Thes. Gram. p. 275, and Lex. p. 227.

Ver. 11. ברצחו יצדיק צדיק צבדי לרבים. The Bishop here omits the word צדיק, on the authority of *three* manuscripts, though supported by the ancient versions; and he supposes this word "to be only an imperfect repetition, by mistake, of the preceding word." Is it not more likely that the word was omitted by mistake, from the similarity of the preceding word, in these *three* manuscripts, than that all the other copies erroneously inserted it? But the Bishop makes the following grammatical remark on it: "It makes a solecism in this place; for according to the constant usage of the Hebrew language, the adjective, in a phrase of this kind, ought to follow the substantive; and צדיק צבדי in Hebrew, would be as absurd as 'shall my *servant righteous* justify,' in English." Of the justness of this remark the Hebrew scholar will be better able to judge, when he has consulted the following passages in the original, in each of which the adjective precedes the substantive. 1 Chron. xxviii. 5. Psalm xi. 7.—lxviii. 14.—lxxxix. 51.—xciii. 4. Prov. xv. 20. Hab. ii. 6. The *Paronomosia* in this passage is also perfectly agreeable to the genius of Hebrew poetry; and of this, Psalm xi. 7. is an instance exactly similar. As to the Bishop's objection to this word, from its spoiling the uniform length of the two hemistichs, it is too frivolous to be noticed. The length of a sentence in the sacred Scriptures is not to be determined by such a *Procrustean* argument.

Far be it from me to insinuate, that the two learned men, whose opinions I have presumed to controvert, have not rendered great and essential services to Hebrew Literature, for which every biblical student is bound to be grateful. But my chief object in these remarks is to caution those young Hebræists, who may peruse them, against *implicitly* adopting their criticisms, and against indulging the fashionable *rage* for unwarranted alterations of the established text, by shewing them that more may be said in its favour than, from the objections continually urged against it by modern translators and critics, they may be led to suppose.

ALBANUS.

For the Christian Observer.

READING lately the twelve first verses of the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the context appeared to me to throw light on the 10th verse, which is confessedly an obscure one, as appears from the various comments on the words "*because of the angels.*" That which seemed to me a probable interpretation may have occurred to many, but as I never met with it, I beg leave to submit it to the opinion of such of your correspondents as have turned their attention to biblical criticism.

The Apostle evidently in the beginning of the chapter is discoursing of the order proper to be observed in religious assemblies, as being founded in that subordination which is of divine constitution. "The head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man:" "for this cause, ought the woman to have power (or a covering in token of being under power) on her head, because of the angels." As if he had said, I enforce obedience to this ordinance from the consideration of the sad effects which resulted from a principle of revolt among the *heavenly intelligences:* departure from the will and order of God deprived angels of their seats among the blessed, who are now the rulers of the darkness and disorder which they first introduced, and still seek to promote, in this world. *Let their example be a warning to the Churches.*

A. A.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE *Serious Inquirer*, in your number for January last, seems to have received some instructions concerning "faith in the righteousness of Christ," which many, who are zealous for that doctrine, do not insist upon; and which are not, as they conceive, at all essential to it, or indeed implied in it. Content with

the language of the Apostle, "we are made the righteousness of God in him;" or that of our articles, "we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings;" we do not say, that "we have perfectly fulfilled all righteousness in him;" which phrase does not so well express the idea of *imputation* as that of *personal obedience.*

Perhaps your correspondent does not exactly mark the line of distinction, between being *accounted righteous* and being *made holy:* for if he did, he would hardly suppose, that being *accounted righteous* implied "being really without spot before God;" for this expression, as I understand it, signifies being perfected in holiness. (Eph. v. 27. Col. i. 21.)

I consider the righteousness of Christ, or, "his personal obedience to the divine law, apprehended by true faith," as so imputed to the believer, that it constitutes his title to eternal life, which neither "oblivion of sin, nor full acceptance of duty," could do. It is the meritorious ground of his being dealt with as an heir of eternal happiness; notwithstanding all his sins and imperfections: for eternal happiness is properly the reward of perfect righteousness. But this act of God, "in justifying the ungodly," and "imputing righteousness without works," neither alters the rule of duty, nor the nature of a man's actions; while it increases the believer's obligations to obedience, and aggravates the guilt of his subsequent sins; and while God looks on believers as in Christ, in respect of justification; he views their character and actions in all respects as they really are in themselves. The righteousness of God, by faith, "which is *unto* and *upon* all that believe," is merely a provision for the honour of the divine law and justice, in making sinners heirs of that happiness, which is properly and exclusively the reward of perfect obedience. The justified believer is also adopted: he is a son and an heir: and the title to his inheritance is given him, on the ground of his brother and surety's meritorious services, and for his sake. But this no more renders personal obedience or sanctification unnecessary, than the entail of an estate renders obedience to a parent, or a good state of health, superfluous. In these respects the obedience of Christ is not, and cannot be, imputed; or if it could, it would be of no use.

But he, who has the title to the inheritance, under the hand and seal, so to speak, of his heavenly Father, still remains an accountable creature fallible and peccable, depraved (though not enslaved to sin,) exposed to temptation, and beset with enemies; and consequently, he is often, more or less, betrayed into sins, negligences, and omissions. He has, however, a tender conscience, and a holy taste; and thus, when he reviews his conduct, he feels ingenuous sorrow and shame, for having offended his heavenly Father; he repents, and humbles himself, with tears and prayers; he welcomes rebukes and corrections, kisses the chastening rod, craves forgiveness, and blesses the gracious care of him, "who restores his soul, and leads him in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake." No man, who is wholly a stranger to this experience, has scriptural proof that the righteousness of Christ is in any sense imputed to him; and all who are deeply acquainted with these conflicts, and this consciousness, must be convinced, if they have a right view of the divine holiness, and the perfection of the divine law, that all their obedience needs forgiveness, and is utterly insufficient and unsuitable to form a title to eternal glory. From first to last they must "count all things but loss; that they may win Christ, and be found in him, not having their own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

But your correspondent objects to what is said respecting the *title to heaven*, and says, that "every loyal subject is not admitted to live at court." As, however, I really do not understand this latter part of his argument, I hope I shall be excused for not attempting an answer. I have, for a long course of years, counted the righteousness of Jesus Christ, imputed to the believer through faith, and sealed on his heart by the progressive sanctification of the

Holy Spirit, the only *meritorious* ground of hope, that he shall at last inherit eternal life, of which the very imperfection of his faith proves him unworthy: yet he will daily feel that very sense of sin, those challenges of conscience for omissions and transgressions, and that need of daily and earnest prayer for pardon, through the atoning blood, which your correspondent speaks of with great feeling, but thinks inconsistent with a state of complete justification. I am persuaded, however, that we do not mean very differently, though the unscriptural views given of imputed righteousness by some, seem to excite unscriptural prejudices against it in others. I must, however, add, that I cannot think any loyal subject of Christ will be willing *always* to be absent from "court;" and that, through the righteousness of Christ and the sanctification of the spirit, he will be expecting shortly to arrive in his presence where is fulness of joy, and to share those pleasures which are at his right hand for evermore. T. S.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE great utility of appropriating a small portion of every day to serious reflection on the state of their souls, is acknowledged by all true Christians, and I hope that a great proportion of them regularly practise the duty in so spiritual a way as to reap the benefit of it. My experience, however, has not made me acquainted with many instances, in which religious persons have required their children, in very early youth, to adopt a similar procedure. Whether they think them too young to make religion so serious a concern; or whether they consider them as too thoughtless and volatile for such meditations; or on what other grounds they may omit to press on their rising families a duty, which they think so important in their own case, I know not: but I am convinced that an opposite course would be found both practicable and peculiarly beneficial. That it would be practicable to lead children to adopt the very salutary habit under consideration, I know from experience: for I am acquainted with a family, in which five children in succession have adopted it, through the divine blessing, on the instructions and exhortations of their parents; and the highly beneficial consequences resulting from it are very apparent in that family.

Indeed I conceive, that almost all real Christians would agree in thinking, that, if children could be induced to practice religious reflection and self-examination for a short time every day, such a custom must, under God, be admirably adapted to counteract the peculiar faults of their age. Is childhood thoughtless? Surely then parents are called upon in a peculiar manner to try to form in their offspring early habits of thought. Is it volatile and little disposed either to take warning from past events, or to be provident with regard to the future? What remedy for this evil is so natural and appropriate, as to lead them to reflect every day on the past, and to extend their view to the leading duties and temptations, which are likely to occur in the next twenty-four hours? Is the season of early youth exposed in a particular manner to gusts of passion, and to a warmth of feeling which ill brooks restraint? Are the charms of novelty then particularly seductive? and does pleasure hold out such allurements on every side as to threaten an entire conquest of the soul? These evils and dangers cannot be better encountered than by teaching the child to call itself often to account; to watch over its besetting sins; and, from the pain which it has suffered on reflecting at the stated seasons on its former faults, be led to guard and pray against their repetition.

But it is by no means sufficient for a child to be barely told, that he must at such an hour every day examine himself, and meditate on the faults he has committed, and on the blessings he has experienced, in the day that is past; and also on the duties he is on the point of being called upon to practise, and on the probable temptations and blessings of the day to come. That he may be disposed to perform the work required of him, and be able to perform it with advantage, his mind must be stored, and his heart impressed, with religious truths: he must have

acquired some degree of zeal to do his duty: and the way in which he ought to proceed in his seasons of reflection, must be pointed out to him again and again on fit occasions, in a plain and familiar manner, by his parents. Supposing this foundation to be laid, and the child to have adopted the practice in question, the parent must not suppose his labours to be finished. He must bear in mind, how ready the enemy is to steal away the good seed from the heart, or by sowing tares among it to ruin the expected crop. He must, therefore, be unremitting in his endeavours to contribute, as an instrument in the hands of God, to the perfecting, establishing, strengthening, and settling those Christian principles and dispositions which alone can give permanence, life, and efficacy to self-examination and reflection. He will watch over the conduct of the child at the times appropriated for religious thought, without interfering with the privacy of the duty, or subjecting him to the temptations to which he would be exposed, were he frequently, or at stated times, required to give an account of the course his thoughts had taken: and he will endeavour, from time to time, to remedy what is amiss, and to improve what is good, in the child's proceedings on those occasions, not so much by an exercise of his authority, as by suggestions and persuasion, and by exemplifying, in a feeling and attractive way, the holy dispositions, and reflections, and aspirations, which befit the seasons of communion with his God and Saviour.

Is any parent disheartened by finding, that it is necessary to employ such exertions, and such persevering watchfulness, if he would succeed in leading his child to the daily exercise of self-examination and religious reflection; and is he therefore disposed not to make the attempt? Let him reflect, that every branch of education requires attention and pains on the part of the teacher, and that "the nurture and admonition of the Lord," opposed as they are to all the natural propensities of the human heart, call for peculiar diligence and care. Does he omit endeavouring to form in his child other habits which he thinks important to his welfare, on account of the difficulties he must encounter? On what ground then will he vindicate a refusal to meet difficulties on this point; (the most important, perhaps, of any to his offspring, because it is more immediately connected with the religion of the heart;) when he has certainly no insuperable obstacles in his way?

Men who are willing to labour in the Christian vineyard, (and this duty is incumbent not only on the ministers of religion, but on all followers of their Saviour,) are, on several accounts, tempted to employ too little of that labour in their own families. Their attention is strongly called by their Christian friends to events in the world around them, and methods of usefulness are suggested, and are almost forced upon them by these friends: but few or none remind them of what ought to be done at home, or stimulate them to daily attention to their children. Abroad, if ministers, they address numbers, and may hope for speedy and striking effects; and though good men, yet their zeal may be somewhat quickened by the vanity and love of importance, which cling to the human heart, even after it is regenerated. They are employed too in a way congenial to their habits, and to the tone of their minds, by being in a sphere, which allows them to make an ample use of their acquired knowledge, and to pour it forth in a copious and manly strain. At home all these things are reversed. There the teacher's audience will consist of, at most, a few children, whose progress in divine things will generally be slow, and often very dubious; and his labours will confer on him no reputation. He will also be obliged to put a restraint upon himself, and lower both his thoughts and his language to bring them to a level with the capacities and knowledge of his children: a mental exercise, which he may, perhaps, find neither pleasant nor easy. Similar causes, though acting in general less powerfully, will lead the religious layman to appropriate too small a share of his christian labours to his own children. But let all parents remember, how much is required at their hands. If

the honour due by children to parents is made the subject of a distinct commandment, undoubtedly that commandment tacitly enjoins, with equal solemnity, the duties of parents towards their children; and among these, care, and zeal, and exertion, and patience in the different branches of instruction, hold a very high place. But the duties of parents are not to be collected from the fifth commandment alone: they are strongly enforced in every part of Scripture. A neglect of these duties might probably be among the causes, which brought the family of Eli into so deplorable a state; and I have no doubt, but that a faithful discharge of them contributed much, under God's blessing, to shed beams of heavenly glory on the death beds of the children of your very interesting correspondent Senex.

B. T.

Jan. 11*th*, 1803.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I CONCUR in the candid wish of Onatrama, that your readers should appreciate for themselves our respective remarks on the term *Co-operation*. My arguments have been primarily directed, not to the defence of a word, but of a principle (Vol. I. p. 783;) yet I still conceive, that Onatrama's conclusion would have been more sound, if, conformably to the fundamental proposition with which he opened the subject (p. 646,) it had inculcated *accurate discrimination* instead of proscription.

It seems expedient to notice some few parts of Onatrama's last observations: but on all accounts I mean to be very brief.

In my allusion to Onatrama's assertion, that the use of the term Co-operation "tends to offend the discerning," my purpose was to intimate that, in my apprehension, he had assumed rather than proved the term to be unwarrantable; and thus had failed to shew reasonable cause for the offence.

To say that every theological expression *tends* to mislead, would be erroneous. But every theological expression may, to some minds, seem to have a tendency to mislead. Do not the followers of Dr. Priestley reproach us with this supposed tendency in the term Trinity, and in other parts of our established theological language? Is the imputation a sufficient reason for discarding the expressions?

By the two texts formerly quoted by me, to which Onatrama has added a third, this fact is ascertained, that in the Holy Scriptures God and man are repeatedly said to *co-operate*. Whether those passages represent man as co-operating with God, or God as co-operating with man, is in truth, a distinction concerning which I think, to adopt Onatrama's words, that it does "*not seem to be of much importance.*" Whether they represent God as co-operating in the salvation of man by his grace, or by his ministers, is also a distinction, which does not seem of much importance to the present question. Under either supposition co-operation is equally admitted: under either supposition the term co-operation might, with equal semblance of justice, be reprobated, as appearing "to convey the idea of auxiliary concurrence; of a reciprocation of aid and a confederacy of abilities and exertions between powers, in some degree, and in some particulars, independent of each other;" and "of our doing something by the exercise of some independent power in ourselves, which should eke out the deficiencies of divine grace, and give efficacy to the operations of God." (Vol. II. p. 81. 82.)

Let me assure your correspondent, whose piety and moderation I sincerely respect, of my solicitude, that constant watchfulness should be exerted to prevent the deduction of false doctrines from our theological terms. The proper method of guarding against that evil is not to proscribe scriptural language, but to explain it. I would repeat, that the particular term in debate is one, to which I have no attachment, and one which I do not know that I have employed.

K. R.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE Querist C. C. in the ninth number of your first volume (p. 577,) has started questions which lead rather to dry dis-

cussions, and to the exercise of theological subtilty, than to edification. I hope, Sir, that you will not suffer such discussions to occupy much room in your miscellany; remembering that theological logicians and metaphysicians are neither the most numerous, nor, perhaps, the most useful part of the Christian world; and, whether numerous or not, the best way of being useful to them is to use all means to induce them to pay less attention to their favourite disquisitions, and more to practical and devotional exercises. I by no means, Sir, mean to apply these observations personally to C. C.; but to speak of the danger of indulging, to any considerable degree, a disposition to nice distinctions, and refined discussions, on doctrinal points.

In the eleventh number, (the last I have seen,) C. C.'s queries are noticed by your correspondent T. S., who expresses a hope, that they will receive a full and satisfactory answer from some of your correspondents. No small knowledge, and ability, and discretion, and Christian piety, however, are requisite in discussing the points to which the queries relate. Without a large store of all these, there will be great danger of the answers to C. C. opening other questions, instead of laying those at rest, which have been already proposed; and of their administering doubt and debate, if not also strife, rather than godly edifying.

After what I have said, you will not suppose, Sir, that I shall offer you many remarks either on the queries of C. C. or on the thoughts of T. S.: but it may promote my object, which is to inculcate the necessity of great caution and distrust in discussing such subjects, to observe, that several of the positions and reasonings of T. S. (and you are not, I think, likely to have a more able correspondent,) appear to me unsatisfactory. This is particularly the case with respect to what he advances on the subject of C. C.'s first query. The query is as follows: "Are not justification, absolution from guilt, forgiveness of sins, and being accounted righteous, synonymous terms for the same blessing?" T. S. remarks (p. 698) on this query, that justification and absolution from guilt "are two distinct benefits, precisely answerable to the pardon granted a criminal, and an estate bestowed on him at the same time." "Pardon of sin exempts a man from all punishment for past transgressions, but it gives him no title to the reward of righteousness." "When the believer is not only absolved from guilt, but made 'the righteousness of God in Christ,' 'the Lord our righteousness,' there is no condemnation for him; but he is by grace entitled to the reward of righteousness." T. S. thus states his view of the scripture doctrines of pardon and justification; but he offers no proof whatever that this view is the just one, and such as entertain doubts similar to those expressed in the queries, will find themselves as far as ever from settled opinions on the points in question.

T. S. endeavours to shew, that the query he is considering cannot be answered in the affirmative, as such an answer would necessarily introduce "the doctrine of *justification by works*, yea, by *the merit of works*." His way of shewing this does not appear to me very clear, but I conceive his argument to be in substance as follows. The pardon of sin exempts a man from punishment for past transgressions, but gives him no title to reward. That title, therefore, must be derived from something else, and men will necessarily seek for it in the merit of their good works.

But if gospel blessings are the free gift of God for the sake of his Son, why may they not be bestowed upon every one who is pardoned, and reconciled to God, through the death of that Son, and thus the pardon of sin be itself an admission to those blessings? Does this appear to our apprehensions to be contrary to the justice of God, or to any of his attributes? If it can be shewn, that Scripture gives a different account of this matter, let the proof be adduced, and every humble Christian will bow to it; but I see no *primâ facie* absurdity in this view of things, which would oblige those, who adopt the opinion that pardon and justification are the same blessing, to have recourse to *the merit*

of works in order to account for the gift of eternal life to the followers of Christ.

But it appears from the reasoning of T. S. (see the first paragraph, p. 699,) that he sees the connexion between justification, and the blessings which accompany it, in the following light. He supposes that the believing penitent, whose sins are forgiven, and who is therefore accounted innocent, would be justified were he able thenceforth to keep "his maker's law perfectly in all its extensive requirements." Now, Sir, this view of things appears to me to give *a merit to good works*, which does not belong to them, and therefore to give an imputed merit to justified Christians to which grace has given them no claim. T. S. looks upon the person, who, having received pardon and complete purification from sin, and a complete restoration of the divine image in his soul, should afterwards keep "his maker's law perfectly in all its extensive requirements," as *deserving* reward on account of this his perfect obedience. Now this is evidently ascribing a merit to his works, which would call for recompense at the hands of his maker. And whence can this merit proceed? Has he done more than was his absolute and indispensable duty?—Certainly not. He seems to me, therefore, as void of merit after such perfect obedience, as he was the moment he received pardon, purification, and a new creation in the divine image. But though this view of things appears to me clearly to result from the relation of the creature to the creator, I should not have entertained it with such confidence as to have opposed it to the opinions of T. S., (for I greatly distrust human reasonings on such points,) had I not thought it fully authorized by our Saviour's discourse in Luke xvii. 7—10, and especially in the last verse, in which he applied the preceding parable to the case of his disciples; "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do."

This is a point which must be settled on scriptural grounds, and not with a view to consequences. But supposing Scripture to oppose the opinions of T. S., those opinions should, I think, be avoided with the greater care, as they attribute a merit to works, which may render it more difficult for the preachers of the Gospel to persuade their hearers to give up all merit, and trust to free grace for salvation. If they are told, that there is such merit in perfect obedience as to deserve the reward of heaven, it may be the less easy to wean them from every idea of merit in imperfect obedience; and thus the evil consequences, which T. S. ascribes to the considering of pardon and justification as the same blessing, may attach, in part at least, to his own view of the subject.

I have abstained from several remarks which occurred to me on reading the letter of T. S.; and what I have offered has been chiefly prompted by a wish to recommend care and caution, both in putting questions and in answering them, on controverted points of doctrine. It is very necessary to obtain as just and as clear ideas as we can on such points, but never to lose sight of the danger of endeavouring to be wise beyond that which is written, or of contracting an inquisitive, subtle, critical, and perhaps, also a debating spirit in religion; which, while it affords a gratifying exercise to human ability, is adverse, in a high degree, to that affectionate simplicity, and warm piety, which shone forth in Christ; and in his followers are the great ornaments of his Gospel. I should be very sorry, Sir, to see the spirit reign among us, which prevails, as I am informed, in one or two of the New England provinces in America, where great numbers are said to be extremely expert in theological definitions, and able to split hairs in doctrines; but their temper and conduct give reason to fear, that they are rather critics in Christianity than Christian people. I hope you, Mr. Observer, will (as you have done) take care, that your publication shall not tend to raise such a spirit among us, but make it your great object to encourage practical and vital religion. I do not mean to say,

that either the queries of C. C., or the thoughts of T. S., (many of which are highly useful,) were improper for insertion in your miscellany; but I trust that you will confine the discussion of the questions they agitate, and of similar questions, within moderate (not to say narrow) bounds. B. T.

Jan. 14*th*, 1803.

For the Christian Observer.

ON SOME POPULAR OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Sed ambitionem scriptoris facilè averseris; obtrectatio et livor pronis auribus accipiuntur: quippe adulationi fœdum crimen servitutis, malignitati falsa species libertatis inest. Tacit. Hist. lib. i. sect. 1.

THE objections against the Church of England respect either the character of her ministers, or the form of her constitution—her government, her doctrine, and her worship.

The charges brought against the established clergy by their enemies, or at least their assailants, are neither few nor trivial. They owe little to their accusers either for the mercy or the moderation of their censures.

There are some circumstances in their attack, which might seem to justify us in ascribing it to an unworthy motive: such, for instance, as an apparent inclination to inflame and exaggerate charges; scurrility, extreme asperity, and language calculated only to irritate; occasional levity, and coarseness of invective; reliance upon the testimony of the avowed enemies of the Christian cause; and, above all, an evident exultation in the prospect of effecting the downfal of the object attacked. But to take no advantage of a representation unfavourable to the impugners of the establishment, we will place the advantage entirely on their side, by supposing both that their charges are founded in justice, and that they originate from the purest and most disinterested motives. Let it be admitted that many, that a majority of the clergy, (it will not surely be required that we should say *all*,) deserve the character given to them by their adversaries—that they are secular, lukewarm, and avaricious; ignorant, negligent, and immoral; that they are guilty of oppression and injustice; are pluralists and non-residents; devoid of all religion, and ready to wade through simony and perjury itself to the acquisition of profit and preferment.

Now, allowing this exaggerated charge to be substantiated, the question is, Whither does it tend? What is its ultimate drift? What is the conduct which it dictates? Does it demand or justify an attempt to overturn and demolish the establishment, of which these unworthy persons are ministers? If the evil complained of, or objected to, can be fairly referred to the establishment as its proper and its natural cause, the solution of the question is by no means difficult. But on a subject which involves consequences of the last importance to religion, we should be cautious in forming an hasty decision. An argument, analogous to that which has been directed against our national Church, has been employed to discredit Christianity itself. The vices of Christians, as they are called, have been urged to undermine the foundations of the religion which they profess. But the futility of the argument is apparent at first sight; and it may be as little applicable in the case which we are considering.

It is a circumstance which will strike and influence an impartial inquirer, that the very vices and corruptions of the clergy, which their opponents inveigh against with so much apparent satisfaction and triumph, are acknowledged, lamented, and chastised, with equal severity, by those whose adherence to the Church is unquestionable. No other names need to be produced in confirmation of this assertion than those of Burnet, Bull, Jones, and Horsley. Did the subversion of the Church appear to these persons a consequence of the corruption of her ministers, necessary either in point of expediency or duty? Or did the consequence hold, only they wanted the penetration to discern it?

Nevertheless, it may be alleged, and with some appearance of reason, that as the Church has temporal emoluments, and those of considerable value in some cases, to bestow upon her clergy; many, who are totally unfit for the office, may be induced to enter into the Church, for no other reason than to be partakers of her affluence. The fact is admitted. It is admitted, that to the influence of this

temptation is owing the greater part of the corruption, with which the sacred office in the establishment is infected and disgraced. Remove this temptation, and without doubt you remove from the Church all those who are influenced by it. But with them you remove many who are labouring with zeal, with diligence, and with success, in the vineyard of Christ; and who, without a provision which should exempt them from the necessity of exertions directed to the support of themselves and their families, would want the means of devoting themselves so entirely to the work of the ministry. But that which suffers the most obloquy is, not the wealth of the Church, but the unequal disposal of it. While upon some of her sons she bestows a pittance which hardly suffices for their maintenance, she lavishes a superfluous abundance upon others. To this objection it is in part a solid reply, that there appears to be a propriety in the appointment, that each class of society, among the laity, should have one of co-ordinate rank among the clergy, with whom they may communicate in spiritual concerns. Many other arguments might be produced to justify the unequal distribution of ecclesiastical wealth, and the more liberal provision for the higher orders of the Church. But in all speculations upon such subjects, we should never lose sight of the materials of which every human society, and the Church among the rest, is composed. Man is a corrupt creature; and his corruption will invade, disturb, and pollute every institution, however sacred. A state of things, therefore, which falls very far short of ideal perfection, should be regarded with acquiescence and contentment, as being, perhaps, upon the whole, the best that could be expected from the infirmity and vitiosity of human nature.*

But not to urge to how small a minority of the clergy the temptation of ecclesiastical emoluments applies, it may be asked, whether there are not very powerful temptations created by the very absence of this one? Are there no temptations arising from poverty? Is there no other way of making a gain of godliness than that which the Church affords? Unquestionably there is; and by how much the more oblique and culpable that way is, so much the greater is the guilt of those who have recourse to it. It may be observed too, that, according to Mr. Locke, the most powerful motives of action are derived from the present sense of pain. There are also other temptations which, in the absence of those arising from the nature of an establishment, are left to operate with their entire force, and are hardly less injurious to religion. What dissentions will not the love of popularity and jealousy of a superior rival excite! How often does a pretended abhorrence of ecclesiastical restraint degenerate into an impatience, even of the restraints imposed by conscience and religion; and he who set out, to all appearance, a sincere, though too vehement Christian, descend through the successive stages of Arianism, Socianism, and Deism, till he reaches the bottomless gulph of Atheism and Libertinism! How frequently are the morbid sensibilities of conscience indulged to such an excess, that violations of express commands are mistaken for indispensable duties, and the grossest illusions of a feverish imagination for impulses of the divine spirit! How often are the unalienable and imprescriptible rights of private judgment made the pretence and cause of much unchristian opposition to forms of church government, and of presumptuous mutilations of sacred verity!

But to return to the temptations which the temporal provision of the Church holds out, and by which wicked men are induced to enter her service: before their vices can be justly laid to the charge of the establishment, it must be proved, that the laws of the Church either sanction, or tolerate, or do not sufficiently provide for the prevention or remedy of those vices. And it should appear that the system is radically and incurably corrupt, be-

* The powerful check which, by means of a *si quis*, the laity possess upon the admission of improper persons into the sacred office, and the liberty which they have of complaining to the bishop of the diocese, of any improper conduct in the clergy themselves, render *them* parties in the charge, if they neglect to use their privilege.

fore the violent expedient of its destruction can be justified.*

An indignation against the abuses existing in the Church, is not only lawful but praise-worthy. If it produces exertions calculated and directed to reform those abuses, such exertions are entitled to the warmest approbation. If, for instance, men of piety, instead of inviting others to separate from the Church, or separating from it themselves, were to unite their influence to render the public worship of the establishment more devout and spiritual, and thus strengthen the hands of faithful and laborious pastors, the gratification of private ambition would, indeed, be less, but true godliness would be greatly promoted.

In all projects of innovation we must weigh the present and certain evils which we suffer, and the present and certain good which we enjoy, against the probable evil and good which will be the result of a change; and an additional argument against the change is the very circumstance of the change itself, which is a positive evil, and in many cases of incalculable magnitude.

With the horrible example of the French revolution, and of the establishment of French impiety before our eyes, we are justified in receiving the suggestion of a change in our ecclesiastical constitution with more than common suspicion and terror. Those who have aspersed the national clergy with the greatest vehemence, are ready, nevertheless, to admit that their services to the community are in many respects important; that the effects of a revolution are much to be dreaded; and that, in the language of the great dramatist, it might be better to

> "Bear those ills we have,
> Than fly to others that we know not of."

If, however, we reflect, that the representation of the clergy which has here been admitted, in order to give the present argument its full force, is greatly exaggerated, and consequently unjust; if we likewise reflect, that the Church possesses within herself the most effectual means of her own reformation, as far as the conduct and character of her ministers are concerned, and that those means only require to be applied and enforced; the desperate measure of a revolution in her constitution will be the last which we shall think ourselves justified in resorting to.

But as the example of the reformation has been repeatedly, and is still, urged to vindicate every species of opposition and hostility to the Established Church, it may not be amiss to add a few words for the purpose of rectifying the mistaken and perverse views entertained upon that subject. The reformation was no SCHISM. It was the effort of some independent parts of the Church, to purify themselves from the corruption which generally prevailed. "We hope, therefore," says the moderate and pious Hooker, "that to reform ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church we were, and we are so still. Other difference between our estate before and now we know none, but only such as we see in Judah; which having some time been idolatrous, became afterwards more soundly religious, by renouncing idolatry and superstition. If Ephraim *be joined to idols*, the counsel of the prophet is, *Let him alone: if Israel play the harlot, let not Judah sin: if it seem evil unto you*, saith Joshua, *to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom you will serve; whether the gods whom your fathers served before the Flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but I and mine house will serve the Lord.* The indisposition, therefore, of the Church of Rome to reform herself, must be no stay unto

* A spirit of persecution is far from being confined to the Established Church. It is the vice of human nature, and has been discovered by all sects, by Presbyterians, by Independents, and by Baptists, whenever power has favoured its indulgence. See a pamphlet entitled, *A Look to the last Century*: or, *the Dissenters weighed in their own Scales*. In these times of general discontent, it might not be amiss for those whose desire of change has not led them to abjure humanity, to read *Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy*—a work, at least, as necessary to a lover of truth as *Neal's History of the Puritans*.

us from performing our duty to God; even as desire of retaining conformity with them, could be no excuse if we did not perform that duty." Eccl. Pol. book iii. sect. i. Oxford edition, vol. i. pp. 354, 355. M.

THE following letter ought to have appeared last year, but from unavoidable circumstances has been delayed. We now insert it with a view to the discussion which is shortly to take place in parliament on the subject of which it treats.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I BELIEVE that many intelligent and reflecting men, both of the clergy and laity, have been a good deal alarmed by Sir William Scott, in his bill on the subject of clerical residence, proposing to vest large discretional powers in the bishops; and still more alarmed by the evident tendency of the arguments of that respectable Baronet, as given in his printed speech, to augment still more the episcopal authority, and so to introduce a most important change into our Church system. It is not, however, my intention to dwell upon these points, but to call the attention of your readers to the *particular nature* of the discretional powers, which were to be exercised by the bishops. The powers to be vested in the bishops by that bill were applicable to three objects; namely, to the enforcing of residence, to the licensing of non-residence, and to the preventing in our lay-courts actions on the subject of clerical residence.

In the case of enforcing residence or licensing non-residence, the clergyman was allowed an appeal to the archbishop of the province; but no appeal whatever from the bishop's decision was to be allowed to the parishioners, or to the patrons of the livings. The bishop, on inserting the ground of his proceeding in a register open to inspection, could license non-residence by his own single authority, in certain cases, which, however, are so numerous and common among the clergy, as to place in his hands a very large discretion. In all other cases whatever, on the recommendation of the archdeacon, and with the concurrence of his metropolitan, he could grant a license of non-residence without divulging the grounds on which he proceeded. A license for non-residence, or a monition from the bishop to the clergyman to enforce residence, was to be a bar to all actions at common law.

These must be allowed to be very extensive powers. And what checks and guards were proposed to prevent their misapplication and abuse? Truly none: for except where the recommendation of the archdeacon, and the concurrence of the archbishop, might be necessary, the bishop was to act individually and in private, without the assistance of either jury or assessors; without any process in his own court; without being obliged to take measures, previously to granting licenses of non-residence, to inform all concerned on what cases he was about to decide, or to collect one tittle of evidence or information, beyond what he obtained from the letters or conversation of the clergymen, who applied for such licenses.

At first sight his power may appear to be effectually guarded, in cases, in which the archdeacon must recommend, and the archbishop concur. But the archdeacon will be the neighbour, and often the acquaintance of those who apply to him for recommendations, and is, therefore, not likely to be very strict in scrutinizing their pleas. Is it not much to be apprehended, that his conduct would partake a good deal of that lenity, which, to the great concern of good men, prevails among the clergy in giving testimonials for orders? As to the archbishop, it is not to be expected that he will take much pains in investigating the cases laid before him by his diocesans. His advanced age, his numerous avocations, his natural wish to agree with his brethren, and to accommodate the inferior clergy, will all concur in inducing him to lend his sanction, with great facility, to licenses of non-residence. Both the archdeacon and the archbishop were (like the bishop) to act in private, and therefore without the salutary

check which must always arise from publicity.

Now, Sir, do your readers recognise, in the foregoing sketch, the genius of the British constitution, which, in uniting a strong government with public and individual freedom, grants occasionally large discretional powers to its magistrates, but grants them under such limits and guards as may best prevent their abuse?

Look at the discretion vested in a justice of the peace. Previously to its being exercised, the parties concerned must be summoned, together with their witnesses; the case must undergo a regular investigation; and whoever thinks himself aggrieved, may either appeal to the Quarter Sessions, or commence an action in the Court of King's Bench, and thus bring the whole case to a fresh hearing in an open court.

Next, look at the circumstances under which our courts of law exercise discretional powers; the Court of King's Bench for instance. The judicial discretion of that court is vested, not in one, but in four judges. They exercise it after full and public investigation, in the presence of a numerous and enlightened bar, and in the face of the public; and they give fully and distinctly their reasons for their decisions.

Even in the army, where large discretion must necessarily be entrusted to the officers, what is the case? Full, and often open, investigation, is generally secured by means of courts martial, and the knowledge and abilities of many are united in forming the decision. And in all cases those who decide are under the control of many superiors, and subjected to the scrutinizing eye of a parliamentary opposition, which is known to pay as much attention to the army as to any part of our political system.

What is the case with respect even to the sovereign? The discretional power vested in him must necessarily be very ample: but how is he to exercise it? In his closet, with or without advisers, with or without deliberation and information, as he may think fit? By no means. The people of England know, that the king is but a man; and, therefore, much as they love and venerate him, they would be sorry to see him entrusted with such ensnaring powers. He can exercise his discretion only in council, and through his ministers, who, by the constitution, are made answerable for its abuse. In one or two cases, in which he may *act* without the intervention of ministers, his *advisers* would be equally answerable.

It cannot be necessary to shew, how different a colour discretion wears in all the foregoing cases, from that which belongs to the powers which were intended to be given to the bishops. With great respect for them, I certainly do not approve of a species of judicial discretion being granted to them, which is not entrusted to any other public functionaries among us, however elevated in station, or high in character.

If the case of clerical residence is to be subjected to episcopal discretion, rather than to the known rules of British law (a question I forbear to discuss), let the discretion at least be of that limited and guarded description, which befits a free country, and not of that pure and simple kind, which accords better with the genius of arbitrary power. Our Church, in truly describing man as weak and prone to evil, tacitly recognises the propriety of vesting no power in rulers without subjecting its exercise to regulations and checks, which may prevent its abuse; and it would be a strange inconsistency if there should be a departure from this course, so advantageous both to the governed and to the governors, when the dignitaries of the Church are themselves to be the depositories of the powers to be granted.

From this general consideration of the subject, let us proceed to a more particular view of it; and endeavour to trace out some of the practical inconveniences which would be likely to follow to the clergy, to the church, to the bishops themselves, and to the community at large, from adopting the provisions of Sir William Scott's bill.

What would be the course of things, were such a law to pass? All non-resident clergymen must immediately apply to their respective bishops for

licenses for non-residence. Each would, no doubt, state his own case in colours as favourable to his suit, as truth would permit; and when it is considered what is the general colour of the *ex parte* statements, made even by respectable persons to justices of the peace, it is much to be feared, that the bounds of truth would not always be exactly adhered to in such statements. A bishop has these statements before him from a very considerable number of his clergy, scattered over every part of his diocese. If he has a proper sense of the importance of the duty he has to discharge, he must wish that the cases submitted to him may be fully investigated; and that his decisions may be wise and satisfactory, both to the clergy at large and to the public.

But what provisions has the law made for the attaining of these ends? Has it appointed a course of investigation after public notice, that all the parties concerned may meet each other and be heard? Has it given the bishop the assistance of others, (as a jury, or assessors,) to divide his labours, rectify his mistakes, fortify him against the solicitations and expostulations of friends or patrons, and share his responsibility? He is to enjoy none of these advantages; and in the granting of licenses of non-residence, (that branch of his business, in which he will be most employed, and be most liable to deception and mistake,) he is not to have the satisfaction of knowing, that if he grants such a license improperly, his error may be rectified on an appeal to another tribunal.

And is it possible, under such circumstances, that justice should be done to the clergy on the one hand, and to the public on the other? The bishop can seldom have an accurate knowledge of the real characters and circumstances of those clergymen, who apply to him on the subject of residence; and he will generally know very little indeed of their respective parishes, especially if his diocese is extensive. Yet in the highly important and embarrassing business thrown upon him, he is to obtain information by his own inquiries as well as he can; to withstand all the temptations which private favour and friendship will assuredly throw in his way, by the unsupported energy of his own mind; and to decide, at last, on his own simple judgment. Is it decent, is it safe, is it just, to put matters on this footing?

And how are the bishops qualified to bear the burden Sir William Scott's bill would throw upon them? Have they the activity and energy of youth; the habits of men of business; and, above all, habits of forensic patience and sagacity in investigation, caution in decision, and firmness in stilling private feelings in the administration of justice? Have they a number of officers in the different parts of their diocese, able and willing to assist them in discovering the truth? Is the case submitted to their judicial discretion, one in which it is not very likely, that any of their friends, or near connections, will be personally interested, and one in which it is not likely that they themselves ever had, at any former period of their lives, any concern? Is it one, in which the *esprit du corps* will not intervene, and make it difficult for them to preserve an unbiassed judgment? It is evident, that in all these respects they will labour under very great disadvantages. They are generally advanced in years. As parish priests, or college residents, the duties of their station has produced habits almost the reverse of those of the lawyer or the judge. The archdeacon is the only clerical officer under them, (except in the cathedral towns,) whose services they could employ in obtaining information: and when the nature of his connection with the bishop, and his situation as a neighbour and acquaintance among the clergy of his archdeaconry, are considered, it will not be thought very likely, that he will be forward to be so employed. As clergymen will be concerned in all the cases respecting residence, and as the question will be one, in which they may be said to be interested on one side, and the laity on the other, the bishop, will be subjected to all the danger of bias arising from *esprit du corps*; a bias to which all professions, not excepting the clerical profession, are known to be subject. And this danger will not unfrequently be greatly aggravated by

the bishop's personal acquaintance naturally lying chiefly among the clergy; so that a considerable proportion of those, who are non-residents, or wish to become so, will either be his friends, or will be able to apply to him through the medium of his friends. Add to this, that the bishop himself may, perhaps, have possessed a living, and been a non-resident, before his elevation to the mitre; nay, it is not impossible, but that, as a bishop, he may not be so uniformly a resident in his diocese, when parliamentary duties do not call him to London, as he ought to be.

But it may be said, these are theoretic objections; at least try the bishops, before you pronounce them ill-qualified for the exercise of the powers in question. Mr. Editor, we have tried them. They have been, and now are, invested with powers to enforce residence by a process in the ecclesiastical courts. It is true, they could not exert those powers without a degree of trouble and expense, which would not admit of their proceeding at once against *all* the non-residents, who ought to reside. But have they proceeded against any? Has any bishop, in any diocese, chosen out two or three flagrant cases, and prosecuted the defaulters? Surely this ought to have been done, especially by the more opulent bishops; and a few examples of this sort might have produced a great reformation among us as to clerical residence. But can one instance of this kind be adduced? I believe not. If then not one of the bishops has used the means of securing clerical residence, with which he has been intrusted, what encouragement have we to invest him with discretional powers so extensive, and so extremely liable to abuse, as those which have been described?

I forbear to paint in as dark colours as the case would warrant, what might be the consequences to the prelacy and to the Church, were such powers granted. At present, when a clergyman is blamed for not residing, the person who censures him may be asked, why, with such sentiments on the subject, he does not commence a prosecution against him. This I have often found an effectual method of allaying the heat of invective, if not of stopping it altogether. But how is the tongue of censure to be quieted, should Sir William Scott's plan be adopted? It would attack the non-resident clergyman; and attack the bishop also for sanctioning his non-residence; and if facts will not warrant a defence of both, no *argumentum ad hominem* could be opposed, as at present, to the assault: all the blame would appear to rest with churchmen, and those who do not wish well to the Church would take care, that she should bear its whole weight.

Should the censurer be one of the non-resident clergyman's parishioners, he would add to his attack on the Church a complaint of personal injury. He would allege, that he was obliged to pay for what he did not receive; that the parishioners, according to the able pamphlet of Dr. Napleton, had originally joined the bishop in granting a revenue to the living, for the express purpose of having a resident clergyman: that they still continued to pay the clergyman; but, through his own fault and the bishop's, he was not a resident among them; and they were deprived of all means of redress for this injury by course of law. I will not repeat the invidious names which would be given to this procedure on the part of the Church. It is too well known, that the profane and the violent would not be sparing of them; and that no small part of those who dissent from the Church would not be displeased to hear them used, and would be ready to fan the flame of discontent in the parish.

This flame would shew itself in almost every case, where the clergyman had not an obvious and valid plea for non-residence. But how greatly would it spread, and how fatal would it be to the fair fame of the Church, and to true religion, when the clergyman, shielded by the bishop's license from prosecutions for non-residence, raised his tithes to their full value. It is painful to contemplate the scene which must ensue in the parish. But it behooves those who love the Church of England, and the Gospel of Christ, well to consider

it before they give their approbation to such a measure as Sir William Scott's.

There is another circumstance which would tend not a little to aggravate the discontent of parishes, and of the community at large, when an improper use was made of the power of licensing non-residence; and would even subject a bishop to animadversion, who made a proper use of this power. I mean the very different courses which would be held in different dioceses, and even in the same diocese under different bishops. When men, invested with judicial power, act according to their discretion, and not according to fixed rules of law, their decisions will take the colour of their respective characters, humours, and circumstances, and no uniformity of proceeding can be expected among them: and this want of uniformity will evidently be proportionate to the want of legal checks and guards on the exercise of their discretion. Suppose then that the bishops of two contiguous dioceses are, one of them strict, and the other lax, in enforcing residence; would not the contrast between the conduct of these prelates aggravate the discontents of those, who thought they had cause to find fault with either? And would it not tend to place the proceedings of him who was culpable, or most culpable, in a very odious light? The same thing would take place in a still greater degree, when two successive bishops, in the same diocese, differed very much from each other in their conduct on the subject of clerical residence.

I will hasten, Sir, to conclude a letter already too long. Many of the preceding observations are powerful dissuasives against investing the bishops with discretional powers *in any form*, on the subject of clerical residence, instead of leaving the common courts of law open, as they have hitherto been, to those who wish to enforce it. But it is not in this way that I apply them. I have confined myself, as much as possible, to a consideration *of the peculiar nature and character* of those discretional powers, with which the bishops were to be entrusted. I hope I have shewn them to be such, as do not accord with the spirit or practice of the British Constitution; and such as the friends of the bishops, the clergy, the Church, and the Gospel of Christ, cannot, after due investigation, contemplate without apprehension and aversion. P. M.

Nov. 23, 1802.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Βουλευομενος, παραδειγματα ποιει τα παρελθοτα των μελλοντων.—Isoc.

The temperate defence of the doctrine and constitution of the Church of England, and the general attention to the practical influence of Christianity, which distinguish the Christian Observer, have, it seems, to some persons occasioned considerable alarm. Whatever you may profess, Dr. Kipling, in particular, has discovered "a design of overturning the Established Church, and plunging the nation in anarchy and blood." A little caution of imputing so much malice even to publications, in some respects exceptionable, might not be improper; because we know who hath said, "*With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.*" But a certain class of writers are so devoid of this caution, that they are at present labouring hard to render odious to the world, and obnoxious to the state, all persons whose zeal and piety they dislike; and whose doctrine they seem determined to misrepresent or misunderstand. This is not, indeed, a new device. Some of the best friends of the Church and Monarchy have, in former times, been treated in the same manner. At present I wish to call the attention of your readers to the case of the venerable Bishop Hall.

The hard measure, which that bishop received at Norwich from the republicans, is generally known. How he was treated, by men of a different description, when Bishop of Exeter, is not, I believe, so generally understood. Let us hear then his own account, as stated by himself, in the "Observations on some Specialities in his life, written with his own hand" "I entered, (saith

he,) upon this place," (the Bishopric of Exeter,) "not without much prejudice and suspicion on some hands; for some that sate at the stern of the Church, had me in great jealousy for too much favour of puritanism. I soon had intelligence who were set over me for espialls; my ways were curiously observed and scanned. However I took the resolution to follow those courses which might most conduce to the peace and happiness of my new and weighty charge. Finding, therefore, some factious spirits very busy in that diocese, I used all fair and gentle means to win them to good order, and therein so happily prevailed, that (saving two of that numerous clergy, who, continuing in their refractoriness, fled away from censure,) they were all perfectly reclaimed; so that I had not one minister professedly opposite to the anciently received orders (for I was never guilty of urging any new impositions) of the Church in that large diocese. Thus we went on comfortably together,* till some persons of note in the clergy, being guilty of their own negligence, and disorderly courses, began to envy our success, and finding me ever ready to encourage those whom I found conscionably forward, and painful in their places, and willingly giving way to orthodox and peaceable lectures in several parts of my diocese, opened their mouths against me, both obliquely in the pulpit, and directly at the court, complaining of my too much indulgence to persons disaffected, and my too much liberty of frequent lecturings within my charge. The billows went so high, that I was three several times upon my knee to his majesty, to answer these great criminations, and what contestation I had with some great lords concerning these particulars, it would be too long to report; only this, under how dark a cloud I was hereupon, I was so sensible, that I plainly told the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, that rather than I would be obnoxious to those slanderous tongues of his misinformers, I would cast up my rochet: I knew I went right ways, and would not endure to live under undeserved suspicions."†

Here then we may observe the causes which brought *Bishop Hall* under suspicion of puritanism. He encouraged those clergymen who were painful, i. e. laboriours in their places. He gave way to peaceable and othodox lectures in his diocese. Those who were guilty of their own negligence observed with envy and disgust the countenance given to so much diligence and piety; and they excited against the bishop the prejudices of the archbishop‡ and of his party at the court. To similar causes, it is conceived, may be referred the outcry which is at present raised against certain clergymen as Methodists, as Gospel-preachers, as threatening danger to the Church, by men who are little disposed to emulate their zeal and diligence. If a clergyman state with perspicuity the first principles of our holy religion, and urge them with effect on the consciences of his hearers; the success attending his ministry affords a pretence for the most unfounded calumny, and the most disingenuous insinuations of mischief either designed, or to be apprehended. However warmly such clergyman may be attached to our happy government and constitution, both in Church and State; however exactly observant of every right of the one, and zealous in the hour of danger to defend the other, still he must be accounted a secret enemy to both. The violent and intolerant maxims, which distinguished the enemies of Bishop Hall, are adopted as infallible axioms; and those who adopt them are loud in their clamours against any clergyman, whose ministry may excite attention, while they appear little concerned at the *total* neglect of the public worship of God by thousands, in almost every part of the kingdom. Certain modern appellations are as convenient and undefined terms of reproach now, as puritanism was when said

* He was Bishop of Exeter certainly as early as 1628. He was removed to Norwich in 1641.

† See *some specialities*, &c. prefixed to the volume of Bishop Hall's works, entitled *Divers Treatises*, &c. printed at London 1662; also to *The shaking of the Olive Tree*, London 1660.

‡ Archbishop Laud.

it before they give their approbation to such a measure as Sir William Scott's.

There is another circumstance which would tend not a little to aggravate the discontent of parishes, and of the community at large, when an improper use was made of the power of licensing non-residence; and would even subject a bishop to animadversion, who made a proper use of this power. I mean the very different courses which would be held in different dioceses, and even in the same diocese under different bishops. When men, invested with judicial power, act according to their discretion, and not according to fixed rules of law, their decisions will take the colour of their respective characters, humours, and circumstances, and no uniformity of proceeding can be expected among them: and this want of uniformity will evidently be proportionate to the want of legal checks and guards on the exercise of their discretion. Suppose then that the bishops of two contiguous dioceses are, one of them strict, and the other lax, in enforcing residence; would not the contrast between the conduct of these prelates aggravate the discontents of those, who thought they had cause to find fault with either? And would it not tend to place the proceedings of him who was culpable, or most culpable, in a very odious light? The same thing would take place in a still greater degree, when two successive bishops, in the same diocese, differed very much from each other in their conduct on the subject of clerical residence.

I will hasten, Sir, to conclude a letter already too long. Many of the preceding observations are powerful dissuasives against investing the bishops with discretional powers *in any form*, on the subject of clerical residence, instead of leaving the common courts of law open, as they have hitherto been, to those who wish to enforce it. But it is not in this way that I apply them. I have confined myself, as much as possible, to a consideration *of the peculiar nature and character* of those discretional powers, with which the bishops were to be entrusted. I hope I have shewn them to be such, as do not accord with the spirit or practice of the British Constitution; and such as the friends of the bishops, the clergy, the Church, and the Gospel of Christ, cannot, after due investigation, contemplate without apprehension and aversion. P. M.

Nov. 23, 1802.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Βουλευομενος, παραδειγματα ποιει τα παρεληλυθοτα των μελλοντων.—Isoc.

THE temperate defence of the doctrine and constitution of the Church of England, and the general attention to the practical influence of Christianity, which distinguish the Christian Observer, have, it seems, to some persons occasioned considerable alarm. Whatever you may profess, Dr. Kipling, in particular, has discovered "a design of overturning the Established Church, and plunging the nation in anarchy and blood." A little caution of imputing so much malice even to publications, in some respects exceptionable, might not be improper; because we know who hath said, "*With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.*" But a certain class of writers are so devoid of this caution, that they are at present labouring hard to render odious to the world, and obnoxious to the state, all persons whose zeal and piety they dislike; and whose doctrine they seem determined to misrepresent or misunderstand. This is not, indeed, a new device. Some of the best friends of the Church and Monarchy have, in former times, been treated in the same manner. At present I wish to call the attention of your readers to the case of the venerable Bishop Hall.

The hard measure, which that bishop received at Norwich from the republicans, is generally known. How he was treated, by men of a different description, when Bishop of Exeter, is not, I believe, so generally understood. Let us hear then his own account, as stated by himself, in the "Observations on some Specialities in his life, written with his own hand" "I entered, (saith

he,) upon this place," (the Bishopric of Exeter,) "not without much prejudice and suspicion on some hands; for some that sate at the stern of the Church, had me in great jealousy for too much favour of puritanism. I soon had intelligence who were set over me for espialls; my ways were curiously observed and scanned. However I took the resolution to follow those courses which might most conduce to the peace and happiness of my new and weighty charge. Finding, therefore, some factious spirits very busy in that diocese, I used all fair and gentle means to win them to good order, and therein so happily prevailed, that (saving two of that numerous clergy, who, continuing in their refractoriness, fled away from censure,) they were all perfectly reclaimed; so that I had not one minister professedly opposite to the anciently received orders (for I was never guilty of urging any new impositions) of the Church in that large diocese. Thus we went on comfortably together,* till some persons of note in the clergy, being guilty of their own negligence, and disorderly courses, began to envy our success, and finding me ever ready to encourage those whom I found conscionably forward, and painful in their places, and willingly giving way to orthodox and peaceable lectures in several parts of my diocese, opened their mouths against me, both obliquely in the pulpit, and directly at the court, complaining of my too much indulgence to persons disaffected, and my too much liberty of frequent lecturings within my charge. The billows went so high, that I was three several times upon my knee to his majesty, to answer these great criminations, and what contestation I had with some great lords concerning these particulars, it would be too long to report; only this, under how dark a cloud I was hereupon, I was so sensible, that I plainly told the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, that rather than I would be obnoxious to those slanderous tongues of his misinformers, I would cast up my rochet: I knew I went right ways, and would not endure to live under undeserved suspicions."†

Here then we may observe the causes which brought *Bishop Hall* under suspicion of puritanism. He encouraged those clergymen who were painful, i. e. laboriours in their places. He gave way to peaceable and othodox lectures in his diocese. Those who were guilty of their own negligence observed with envy and disgust the countenance given to so much diligence and piety; and they excited against the bishop the prejudices of the archbishop‡ and of his party at the court. To similar causes, it is conceived, may be referred the outcry which is at present raised against certain clergymen as Methodists, as Gospel-preachers, as threatening danger to the Church, by men who are little disposed to emulate their zeal and diligence. If a clergyman state with perspicuity the first principles of our holy religion, and urge them with effect on the consciences of his hearers; the success attending his ministry affords a pretence for the most unfounded calumny, and the most disingenuous insinuations of mischief either designed, or to be apprehended. However warmly such clergyman may be attached to our happy government and constitution, both in Church and State; however exactly observant of every right of the one, and zealous in the hour of danger to defend the other, still he must be accounted a secret enemy to both. The violent and intolerant maxims, which distinguished the enemies of Bishop Hall, are adopted as infallible axioms; and those who adopt them are loud in their clamours against any clergyman, whose ministry may excite attention, while they appear little concerned at the *total* neglect of the public worship of God by thousands, in almost every part of the kingdom. Certain modern appellations are as convenient and undefined terms of reproach now, as puritanism was when said

* He was Bishop of Exeter certainly as early as 1628. He was removed to Norwich in 1641.

† See *some specialities*, &c. prefixed to the volume of Bishop Hall's works, entitled *Divers Treatises*, &c. printed at London 1662; also to *The shaking of the Olive Tree*, London 1660.

‡ Archbishop Laud.

to be favoured by Bishop Hall. Amongst the ignorant and inconsiderate of all classes, many give easy credit to calumny when piety is the object of it. Contempt is excited which precludes examination, and the want of evidence of guilt is supplied by determined prejudice. There are, however, instances, some known to the present writer, where, upon a candid examination of the men and the doctrine traduced, the real character of both has been found as amiable, as the caricature has been frightful. The result has been, what from ingenuous candour might be expected. A full conviction has been produced, that the men who are by their enemies represented as a sect, and as such every where spoken against, do in fact hold forth the word of life, as it is received and taught by the authentic institutes of the Church to which they firmly adhere; and, that amidst abuse and ill-treatment from their enemies, they are indeed labouring both by their life and doctrine to set forth the glory of God, and to forward the salvation of all men.

CLERICUS.

MISCELLANEOUS.

MODERN CHARACTERS.

NO. IV.

CHARACTER OF EUSEBIA CONTINUED.

I PROPOSE now to describe the manner in which Eusebia is accustomed to interpret Scripture. It has pleased God to reveal to us his will, through the medium of his word; but we are apt to defeat the ends of revelation by giving erroneous interpretations to the book of God. How endless are the varieties of opinion, even among those who profess to derive their religious sentiments from this source. Is then the Bible vague in its expression, as unbelievers, reasoning from the multitude of our controversies, are ready to assert; or is it, as the papists say, so obscure and mysterious, that only the ministers of religion ought to presume that they can explain it?

I have already intimated, that Eusebia understands her Bible in the popular and unlearned sense. She considers it as treating, not of curious or abstruse questions which exercise the faculties of a few, but of religious truths, which demand the attention of all; and as aiming to give a warm impression of these truths, by sometimes adopting a seemingly negligent boldness of style, rather than as speaking with an uniformity of verbal precision. She applies to the scriptures the same rules of interpretation, which she would use in the case of another book. She marks the circumstances under which each part was written, attends to the context, frequently compares one passage with another, which the extent of her biblical knowledge makes it easy for her to do, and adding earnest prayer for the divine assistance, she experiences increasing edification and pleasure, and less and less difficulty in the perusal.

Theodosia misunderstands her Bible, by aiming to be too deep. She deems it a "sealed book" to those who are not accustomed to spiritualize every part of it; and being in quest of the less obvious sense, she not unfrequently loses the benefit of a plain practical precept of which she stands in need. She views, for example, the parable of the good Samaritan only in the light of a doctrinal illustration of the subject of redemption. He that has fallen among thieves is assumed to be human nature, or man in general. The Levite is the law which cannot save us; the good Samaritan is our Saviour. She is perplexed to know what is meant by the priest, who, as well as the Levite, passes by the other way; and on the subject of the two-pence she is at some loss. When I reflect how minute is her system of interpretation, I wonder that she is not staggered at observing, that the man who has fallen among thieves, is said to be only "*half* dead;" a very unsound term, as she must admit, when applied to human nature. She considers not that the parable is related by Christ in answer to a Jew, who was apt to hate men

of another sect, and asked, "who is my neighbour?" and that it was meant to correct this practical error. Theodosia in like manner too much confines her charity to persons of exactly her own persuasion; and the passage therefore, if justly interpreted, might contribute to correct in her this fault. I mean not to deny that our Saviour may, in some general manner, be likened to the good Samaritan. My objection is to Theodosia's adopting this as the only true mode of interpretation, and to her regarding the passage as a clear testimony in favour of the chief doctrines of Christianity. The Scriptures, if all persons are allowed to interpret them on this plan, may have a thousand different significations, and may be made to convey any meaning which a fertile imagination is able to deduce from them.

Amanda errs after a very different manner. Her complaint of not being able to comprehend the doctrinal parts of the New Testament, arises from her taking too little interest in them, and from a general defect of piety. She mistakes even the practical passages. Her favourite sermon on the mount, is far more strict than she supposes it to be; and will never be well interpreted by her until her standard of practice is greatly raised. With her present views, it is impossible, for instance, that she should understand what it is to "hunger and thirst after righteousness," to "enter in at the straight gate," to "cut off the right hand and pluck out the right eye;" neither can she have an adequate conception of "that purity of heart," to which is annexed the promise of "seeing God;" or be aiming to be "perfect even as our heavenly father is perfect."

The advantage which Eusebia possesses, in the interpretation of Scripture, is to be traced to more fervent piety, to greater simplicity, and to a fuller acquaintance with the Bible, rather than to superior powers of understanding. She has been taught, that "the meek will he guide in judgment, the meek will he teach his way." She possesses, it is true, more than ordinary talents, but these, though useful, are by no means to be considered as necessary for the object in question. She also possesses some natural wit, but for this endowment she has no use when she reads the Bible. Theodosia summons up her wit for the very occasion on which Eusebia dismisses it. There is a quaint humour in her construction of dark texts of the Old Testament, which extremely diverts the imagination of those who listen to her, and does not even allow the muscles of their face to be perfectly at rest. If Amanda should hear some of these ludicrous interpretations, and should talk of them among her circle, there would unquestionably be no bounds to the general laughter, and the evil might be the more serious, inasmuch as the truths deduced are often as solemn and important, as the mode of inferring them from the text is extravagant and ridiculous.

There is another difference in Eusebia's mode of interpreting Scripture, which must be explained. Eusebia first considers the meaning of each passage, as applied to those to whom it was immediately addressed. She, therefore, takes into her contemplation the circumstances of ancient times, and then deduces the instruction applicable to herself. Theodosia proceeds in a shorter manner: she makes no allowance whatever, for difference of times. Amanda is in the opposite extreme: she considers the epistles as so exclusively written to the ancient Churches, that they can be of little or no use to us.

Theodosia once fell into the company of Amanda, whose character she very ill understands, and whom she considers as a perfect heathen. Being desirous of awakening her to some sense of her danger, she took occasion to speak of the sad state of the unconverted, and to represent how strongly their wickedness was described in the word of truth. They were "foolish," she observed, "disobedient, deceived ——" here Amanda suspected that she herself was alluded to—"serving divers lusts and pleasures,"—she now doubted whether she were the object of the remark—"living in malice and

envy, hateful and hating one another." —Amanda upon this felt extremely comforted; for she was sure that she was not "living in malice and envy, hateful and hating" her fellow-creatures, and she proceeded to infer, that not being of the number of the unconverted she must of course be a true Christian. Theodosia not finding Amanda's conscience to be sufficiently alarmed, conceived it necessary to call a still stronger quotation to her aid. She stumbled on that passage of the Epistle to the Romans, in which it is said respecting the wicked of those more violent days, "their feet are swift to shed blood." Amanda was now most satisfactorily persuaded, that neither she nor any of her friends were intended to be reflected on, and she suspected that the remark was pointed at the French.

I think that I know exactly how Eusebia, half of whose difficulties, in some circles, consists in rectifying the misconception produced by the vehemence of Theodosia, would have turned the discourse had she been present. She would have remarked, that the Scriptures often enumerate many sins as characterizing the wicked, without intending to charge each sin upon them all; and that, in describing a sinful state, they may be supposed, in some respects, to present an exact picture rather of the ancient than of the modern sinner. The principles, from which they severally act, she would however affirm to be the same; and that while the conduct of the latter, from being less openly flagitious, might not admit of being characterized in terms equally strong with that of the former, it might notwithstanding be attended with a much larger portion of guilt. She would have shewn that, in our days, the general standard of morals having been raised, (an advantage which we owe to Christianity,) some of those, particularly in the upper ranks, whom the Scriptures would consider as the wicked, are rendered decent in their manners, by mere regard to character and interest. She would have proceeded to observe, that women, in particular, ought to take great care lest they should be deceived through this change of circumstances; and she would have insisted, that the question which they ought to ask themselves, is not, Whether they equal in vice the ancient heathens, but whether they resemble in true piety and virtue those whom alone the Apostles considered as Christians. I do not say that Eusebia would have entered into all these observations with the same particularity, if the individual, whom she had addressed, had been one of the lowest class. Persons of this description are not apt to be equally offended and misled, even though their sins should happen to be unintentionally overcharged; and, indeed, when they are extremely irreligious, they nearly resemble the ancient heathens. She would also have spared part of her remarks, if she had been conversing with any person of the higher order, who was a notorious evil liver. I mean only to say, that although she is a very faithful interpreter of Scripture, she has a reasonable and scriptural mode of making an application of it to present characters.

Her idea is, that the faithfulness of a minister does not consist in preferring, as Theodosia does, general and unmeasured charges of guilt against all persons, but rather in endeavouring to present to every one the picture of his own corruption.

Eusebia considers those passages of the New Testament, which speak of the persecution to which Christians were to be exposed, as by no means applicable to modern times in their original strength. The Gospel being now generally professed, principles of toleration having gained ground, and an abundantly better security against injuries being enjoyed under our happy constitution than was afforded by the heathen governments, it cannot, as she conceives, be fairly affirmed that Christians are now generally persecuted. Religious indifference, as she suspects, is the great evil of the present day. It is true, indeed, that she herself is complained of, and occasionally derided by many persons, as far too strict, and that she fights manfully against the

world under the banners of her Saviour; but she does not presume to give to the little trials that she encounters, the same appellation which would be proper in describing the conflict of the Apostles. She remembers, that they endured "cruel mockings, and scourgings, and bonds, and imprisonments," and died martyrs to the faith.

Theodosia, on the other hand, considers the texts, which speak of persecution, to be as applicable to her as to St. Paul himself, and hence she is encouraged in her habit of courting opposition, an opposition which she excites by her extravagance and faults. She scarcely seems to herself to have carried a sentiment sufficiently far, until she has provoked some objection to it. The objection, however reasonable and calmly stated, is construed to be persecution, and the persecution to be a mark of grace. Does this statement appear too strong? Let me then illustrate it: the illustration will furnish an additional proof of the advantage of Eusebia's system of interpretation.

Theodosia talks much of the "doctrine of the cross," of the importance of "preaching Christ," and of the great offence which will infallibly follow. She also persuades herself, that she has the Scriptures entirely on her side, in all that she affirms on this subject. "God forbid," she says, "that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." She determines "to know nothing, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." These expressions, when in her mouth, signify that the bare doctrine of Christ crucified is the only part of religion which is entitled to much attention; and that even the practice belonging to this very doctrine needs not to be particularly explained and enforced. Does any person object, that her views of this subject are pushed to extravagance, and that her whole religious system is too little practical? She congratulates herself on the offence which she has given: it is the offence of the cross.

I now come to Eusebia's mode of interpreting the same texts. She also determines to "know nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." She has talents, knowledge, and accomplishments; but the knowledge of "Christ, and him crucified," is in her eyes the only knowledge which is truly valuable. All her various attainments, as will be more fully shewn hereafter, are made subservient to her one great end of glorifying God, and promoting the cause of her Redeemer. She may be also said to "glory in the cross." She has no confidence in her own goodness, but entirely trusts for salvation to the great and all-sufficient sacrifice once made by her Redeemer. She knows also, that this doctrine of redemption by the sole merits of another, a doctrine which she zealously affirms and to which she cordially adheres, is despised and disbelieved by some, is corrupted and evaded by others, and is negligently received by many more. Nevertheless, she does not assume, like Theodosia, that this article of her faith must expose her to persecution, or must necessarily raise strong prejudices against her character.

Eusebia may be said to glory in the cross in another and a more general sense; I mean by being in all respects the faithful servant of him who was crucified, and by shewing herself ready to bear reproach on account of her devotedness to him. She does not, however, consider any peculiar contumely as now likely to be cast upon her, on the ground merely of her being the follower of one who endured the ignominy of crucifixion, as was the case with St. Paul. She is well aware that circumstances have, in this respect, changed, and that the cross, which once inspired general contempt, is now commonly thought to have had much honour reflected on it, by having borne the body of the acknowledged Saviour of the world.

The cross, therefore, taken in the more strict and literal sense of the term, is not understood by Eusebia as now involving that contempt, which it called forth in the days of the Apostles; a contempt which Theodosia assumes to be always equally associated with it. The present reproach of Christ, in Eusebia's esteem, is that which is cast upon sincere and devout believers, in consequence of their practical, as well

as doctrinal, difference from the mass of nominal Christians around them; and often results much more from the singularity of their conduct than of their faith.

Theodosia has fallen into a variety of errors, from which Eusebia, through her better mode of interpreting Scripture, is exempt. Theodosia, for example, is so enthusiastic as to think, that study is not necessary to a minister, and I question whether she does not prefer almost any extemporaneous sermon to the best written discourse, on the ground of her supposing, that unpremeditated addresses from the pulpit are more peculiarly dictated by the Holy Spirit. She has been betrayed into this sentiment, partly by a misconstruction of that saying of Christ to his Apostles, "But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak; for it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your father which speaketh in you." Eusebia marks the circumstances under which this assurance was given; she knows that this was one of many special promises made to the twelve Apostles, on the occasion of their being first sent forth to preach and to work miracles and she would as soon expect that God's providence would now interpose in favour of one, who should "provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in his purse" when he should be about to take a journey, as that extraordinary grace should be vouchsafed to him who should, in these days, ascend the Christian pulpit, "having taken no previous thought how or what he should speak."

I will name a still greater error of Theodosia. She is apt to consider the promises of the Bible with little reference to the character of the person to whom they are given, a fault in which Amanda, in some degree, participates. When she reads the various promises of the Old and New Testament, she endeavours, in a somewhat enthusiastic manner, to believe that these are words spoken to herself. She does not examine into her heart and life, in order to know whether she is one of those to whom they properly belong; but she assumes, that she is entitled to just as much comfort from the passages in question, as she finds herself able to enjoy. Amanda has a more cold and general way of applying to herself the divine promises, though she also fails to inquire into her right to them. The one is inclined to think that they belong only to the elect, but that all are elect who can take comfort in the contemplation of their privileges. The other assuming, that we are a generation of Christians, applies to herself the promises made in Scripture to the *saints*, on the ground, chiefly, of her having been baptized, and of her being one of this Christian nation.

Eusebia, on the contrary, connects the privileges of a believer with his duties. She knows of no "communion with God," of no "experience of his love," which are not combined with love to him issuing in obedience. She remembers that in her Testament are such passages as these, "If a man love me *he will keep my words*, and my father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." "Ye are my disciples, if ye *do* whatsoever I command you."—"Every one that hath this hope *purifieth himself* even as he is pure."

There is one respect in which Amanda and Theodosia remarkably agree, and in which Eusebia differs from them both; I allude to their mode of interpreting the prophetic parts of Scripture. The French revolution excited, for a time, in these two ladies, in other respects so discordant, a similar curiosity on the subject of ancient prophecy; for it seemed to each of them to be one of those great events which they might expect to find foretold in holy writ; and I rather think, that immediately after the death of Louis they both turned over nearly the same pages of Daniel and the Revelations, in quest of some passage that should speak of this particular occurrence. They both mistake the intention of prophecy, and they err by being too verbal and minute in their mode of

understanding it. Eusebia has paid considerable attention to the subject, with a view to the confirmation of her faith. It forms a part of that body of evidence, the examination of which has contributed to convince her of the truth of Christianity. But she does not suppose that prophecy was intended to teach *us* to predict events, nor does she gather her duty from it; and she is much afraid of all fanciful expositions of it, as in the issue encouraging scepticism instead of strengthening belief.

A few years ago Theodosia very confidently inferred from some passages in the Revelations, that the Pope never would be restored; and she conceived that the government of this country erred in respect to some of their measures, through their inattention to the prophecies respecting the fall of Anti-Christ. She also felt a strong persuasion, that the millennium was approaching, and to this notion may be referred her too sanguine expectation of immediate and extensive effects from the various missions which have been recently undertaken, as well as an extraordinary donation which she granted for their support. I have heard that she lent an ear to the prophecies of *Brothers*, and derived much consolation, at one time, from the characteristic quotations of *Poor Help*, though, in these instances, not so credulous as some of her acquaintance of an inferior class. Amanda is as little disposed as Eusebia to place her faith in such prophets.

But the great advantage of Eusebia arises from the practical application of the Scriptures to her own heart and life. She reads them not like Theodosia, for the sake of the self-complacency enjoyed in seeing those doctrinal truths confirmed for which she is contentious, nor like Amanda for the purpose of fulfilling a customary task; but with a view to grow in grace, and to become acquainted with the whole will of God. Deeply sensible of her natural ignorance, and earnestly supplicating the aid of that spirit by which she believes her whole Bible to have been inspired, she both dwells on great and leading truths, and also seeks to be delivered from those numberless partialities, prejudices, and errors, into which she knows that even they, who are of the most orthodox creed, are liable to fall.

She profits by every part of the sacred word. From the Old Testament she derives authentic information respecting the creation, and the fall of man; a strong impression of the corruption of the world; exalted ideas of the character of God; large and comprehensive views of the dispensations of his providence; a particular acquaintance with the Jewish history; much knowledge, which is introductory to the belief of a mediator; very important helps to devotional religion; and abundant lessons of the most plain and practical wisdom.

But the New Testament is the great subject of her study. The birth of the promised Saviour, the nature of that kingdom which he came to establish, and the dispositions which characterise the members of it; the compassion which he exercised, the miracles which he wrought, the reproofs which he administered, the contradiction of sinners which he endured, the precepts which he delivered, the doctrines which he taught, the condescension, meekness, and humility, which he manifested, the dignity and authority which he at the same time asserted, the submission which he shewed to the will of his father, and the love which he bore to our fallen race; above all, the death which he died as a sacrifice for sin, and his resurrection and ascension to the right hand of God;—all these objects engage her eager attention, and give to the Gospels a weight and value which are in her eyes unspeakably great.

The subsequent effusion of the Holy Ghost, the conversion of many of the murderers of Christ, the labours and trials of the Apostles, the victories which they atchieved over Jewish prejudice, the calling of the Gentiles, and the establishment of one new and glorious and universal Church, form equally the subject of her meditation and pious delight.

Nor is she less attentive to the seve-

ral epistles of the New Testament. By the aid of these, she endeavours to enter into every feeling of the Apostles. She aims to form the same estimate which they did both of the present and of the future world; to comprehend the nature of their faith and hope, and the ground of their joy in the midst even of tribulation. She marks the great principle by which they were actuated,—love to him who, as it was now revealed to them, had suffered crucifixion for their sakes; and a desire to live no longer to themselves, but unto him who died for them. She also pays earnest attention to every practical exhortation which they delivered, whether to "honour the King," to "submit to magistrates," "to obey parents," or to "mark them which cause divisions in the Church." She bows to the admonition "to render to all their due," to "give unto servants that which is just and equal," to "pay tribute," and to let those freely "reap our carnal things," who are employed in the spiritual office. She also is instructed to "bridle the tongue," and "not to give place unto wrath;" to "follow peace with all men," to be patient and forbearing, humble and thankful, "pitiful and courteous;" to "rejoice with them that rejoice, and to weep with them that weep;" to put on that "charity which is the bond of perfectness," and without which, though we should understand all mysteries and all knowledge, we are but as "sounding brass, and as the tinkling cymbal."

Her religion, therefore, is without prejudice or partiality. It may seem inaccurate to some metaphysical theologians, for she has not been so careful to complete, after their manner, her system of divinity, as to pursue that kind of perfection in piety, which results from a diligent attention to all the scattered truths of God's word. She has many sincerely religious friends, who a little differ from her in their views, but these friends do not separate so far from Eusebia as from each other; for they depart to contrary sides. She therefore lives in charity with the pious of every description. Her religion, however, lying in the middle way between opposite extremes, gives much offence to no inconsiderable number of persons; and even to some who make high pretensions to religion. It is too moral for the enthusiast, too spiritual for the moralist, too gentle as well as charitable for the violent, too fervent and animated for the lukewarm. It is too difficult for the thoughtless, too intelligible for the mystic, too serious for the votaries of gayety, too cheerful for those who would make religion to consist in melancholy, too general to be relished by the little parties and sects which severally contend for their petty peculiarities. Above all, it is a religion which is hateful to the unrepenting sinner, and which carries alarm to the heart of the unbeliever; for in Eusebia, the impenitent and the unbelieving find an evidence, not easy to be resisted, of the truth and excellency of the word of God.

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I AM almost ashamed to shew my face among your correspondents, after having raised an hornet's nest about your eyes and ears, by my first communication. I was really surprised at the scrape into which I had brought you and myself, and carefully looked over the letter to see what it was that could give such offence. I suppose honest people, of every denomination, that are serious in religion, must wish to see it flourish in their own way, as they believe that a Christian thus formed is "the highest style of man." No blame was, therefore, intended to be cast upon the Methodists or Dissenters, for endeavouring to draw as many people as they can after them. In this they act consistently, and shew that they are sincere in the preference they give to their own peculiar mode of edification and instruction. But why should they censure a clergyman of the establishment for desiring to see the peace, and spiritual prosperity of his own Church; for lamenting the inroads that are made upon her; and for recommending to his clerical brethren the same consistency of conduct with principle which he respects in others?

Had W. R. said that the dissenting interest was a *limb of Anti-Christ*, as

Sectarius Pacificus has said of the Church of England; or had he represented the main body of Methodist preachers as lying prophets who ought to be slain with the sword, and the most exemplary characters among them, as no better than *Satan transformed into an angel of light*, as the president of a late CONFERENCE of the Methodists has described the established clergy in his printed sermons; he might, indeed, have been justly charged with uttering "a sweeping censure," and making an "illiberal and unmanly attack." He has attaked no man; he has judged no man; but simply mentioned a known fact, that the Church of England has been bereaved of a vast multitude of her children by the incautious conduct of some of her own ministers, who, in their haste to do good, forgot that there was such an evil as schism. Surely those who reflect upon its nature and tendency ought to guard against it.—But is there such a sin as schism? Dr. Aikin says it was a bug-bear, that formerly terrified scrupulous consciences, but is now completely exploded, like witchcraft and magic. Why then conjure up its ghost to frighten honest people, who want to break off *the fetters* of the establishment? Yet the nonentity of schism is quite a modern discovery. Even among the Dissenters of the last age, it held its place in the catalogue of existing sins. In looking over a volume of Dr. Watts's works, for even W. R. reads and admires Dr. Watts, I found much said against it, confirmed by extracts from the writings of Baxter and other eminent non-conformists—with what consistency is another affair. Nor has the superior light of this age of free inquiry entirely dispelled such antiquated prejudices; for as some vulgar minds are still haunted with notions of witchcraft, and the terror it inspires, so there are old fashioned Christians who are still afraid of schism, and cannot make any sense of twenty passages of Scripture, unless they are to be considered as strong warnings against its evil and danger. *S. P.* should pity and forgive us, as subject to terrors which his stronger mind can shake off. But how can we forgive him for representing our mother, the Church, as "a main branch of the Anti-Christian system," or the woman arrayed in purple and scarlet, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the saints, &c.? This is terrible; but we must forgive it, as he cannot, on any other ground, vindicate separation from her. Yet I am afraid that, notwithstanding his name, the principle of dissent which he avows will never permit him to be quiet, till he is laid in his grave; for as often as this name recurs, it puts me in mind of a story told of Archbishop Dawes, who loved a pun. The first time he received his clergy at dinner, after the death of his wife, he said, "Gentlemen, I am glad to see you all again; but I am afraid you will not find things in such order as they were in poor Mary's time. Ah! she was indeed *Mare Pacificum*."—"Yes," replied one of the company, "after she became *Mare Mortuum*."

We must also endeavour to forget and forgive the "sweeping censure" passed upon the whole body of the established clergy, by *president P.* in his sermon, especially as the conference, in their minutes, say that their venerable brother did not mean to stir up any persecution against us, by the expressions he employed; and as he himself has expunged one of the most offensive passages concerning the clergy, and even allowed that some of them are of use in awakening careless sinners.

While we are thankful for this concession in our favour, we must take care to keep within the sphere of usefulness, the president has assigned us, if we would retain our popularity. The moment we attempt to educate our own children at home, and instead of sending them to a wet or dry nurse, prefer for them their mother's milk, as more wholesome and nourishing than that of strangers, we give offence to those who wish to be employed in this way. If we are fond of popularity, dislike the trouble of rearing a family of children, and love no part of the pastoral office but preaching to a large congregation, we must be careful not to offend such persons (who

can puff as well as revile) by endeavouring to counteract their schemes. But if we are really engaged in the service of the Church, with those views which every conscientious clergymen ought to have of her excellency, as the pillar and ground of truth and social order in the land; if we consider a Christian education, according to her doctrines and rules, as calculated to form a character far more amiable and useful than any other; and if we regard every separation from her communion as productive of mischief and confusion; we ought to take heed that she receives no detriment from our negligence or disorderly conduct.

Yet there is a peculiar trait in the character of a true churchman, which must always make him an unequal match for zealous separatists. He cannot bring himself to think so ill of them as they do of him, or to suspect that they are not in a state of salvation. Hence he always acts upon the defensive, and never takes any pains to draw over to his communion those who are settled in any other which holds the fundamental truths of Christianity.

This is a curious circumstance, and yet undoubtedly true. I do not know one serious Churchman, who has not been tampered with to change his religion, and assailed by proselytes of various sorts, who have attempted to unsettle his principles, to put him out of love with his Church and authorized teachers, and to shew unto him a more excellent way; though I do not remember one instance of our attacking them, or seeking to lead them away captive to our Babylon, as *S. P.* calls the Church of England. If this is a defect it is an amiable one, and cannot be cured but by introducing a portion of bigotry into our constitution, which would be a remedy worse than the disease.

For my own part I have not the least inclination to make reprisals, as I cannot doubt about the safety of all, in every denomination of Christians, who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. But supposing, as is probably the case, that *S. P.* and *P. P.* express the general sentiment entertained by their respective sects of the Church of England and the very best of her clergy, the Dissenters must press all serious people to "come out of her, lest they partake of her plagues;" and the Methodists must labour to draw them from us into their CONNEXION, where they will be better instructed, and taught the way of the Lord more perfectly. Thinking as they do of us, they cannot conscientiously act otherwise. I blame them not on this account, nor even the Roman Catholics, who are a far more numerous and formidable body, in this place, than all the other sects put together.

I shall only add, that what I wrote did not flow from pique, but principle. As I never received those personal provocations, which are suggested in some of your pages where I am mentioned; never saw the Church bereaved of her children here, as she has been in many other places, I am really not entitled to the excuse which has been made for me.

In the enclosed letter, from Mr. Walker to Mr. Adam, the Methodists are mentioned in a way which can hardly be thought uncandid. None of your readers need be alarmed at the re-appearance of this correspondence. Neither of the writers were uncharitable or narrow-minded men, though zealous for established order. But whatever may be said, you are not to be responsible for it. From the very nature of your candid and useful miscellany, many things must be allowed a place in it, which cannot claim your unqualified approbation. He must be an unreasonable correspondent indeed, who expects every person to think exactly as he does.

I find that you, Mr. Observer, are looked upon as a kind of amphibious animal, neither fish nor flesh, too much attached to the old doctrines of the Church to be endured by divines of the modern school, and too steady a friend of established order to be liked by those who separate themselves from her. Now as this happens to be pretty much the light, in which

my own character, and that of my deceased fathers, are considered, I think you should, from sympathy and fellow-feeling, admit us occasionally into your monthly parties.

W. R.

Mr. Walker's letter, if possible, in our next.

FRAGMENTS OF A VOYAGE.

(Concluded from p. 156.)

FRIDAY.—The country now in our view, is particularly interesting, as being the parent of a race of men, who made the longest and firmest stand against Roman tyranny; and, in later times, were as famed for hardihood and valour as any of the inhabitants of Europe. How is the picture now reversed! Her bold mountains, as we have ocular proof, remain: but the heroes they nourished have given place to a degenerate progeny, debased by papal and regal despotism, and seduced, by the wealth of Peru and Mexico, to exchange the honest and wholesome gains of agriculture and legitimate commerce for sloth and indulgence. The powers of body and mind, necessary for the attainment of their former objects, were no longer exercised. The precious metals flew to them across the Atlantic without any exertion on their part; and their vigour and sagacity, having been long suffered to sleep, lost their tone, and they were punished by the signal degradation of those important faculties which they refused to employ. This appears to have been the lot of all the higher orders, and to have rivetted their civil and religious chains. The lower orders must always partake of the evils which fall on the higher, and be subjected to others by the debasement of their superiors. From various causes the commonalty in Spain have suffered, in both these respects, in an extraordinary degree. The domineering power of France has extinguished the political independence of this miserable land; and she may now cry out, with peculiar propriety to all her enemies and rivals, and to none more than to the navy of Britain, *non sum qualis eram; parce, parce, precor.* I am glad that I have seen her shores. The sight may contribute with the divine blessing to give force to the lesson her history is intended to convey to us.

Captain A——— gives an extremely pleasing account of a Danish crew, with whom he once sailed. All were called up to prayers every morning. There was through the day no appearance of profaneness or other gross vice among them, but they lived together with much cordial good will, and in the true spirit of mutual sympathy and accommodation, more like a family of relations than a ship's crew. He believes, that the state of things is in general pretty similar to this in Danish ships. Earnestly do I wish that the same could be said of British!

Saturday.—The absence of many little comforts we enjoy on shore at once proves to us their value, heretofore too little noticed; and affords us a useful lesson of self-denial, and of the importance of not giving way to habits of effeminacy and indulgence, when delicacies and luxuries are within our reach. The sickly state of our servants making it unreasonable for us to expect the attendance to which we have been accustomed, we are each of us taught the importance of being able to perform little offices of all kinds for ourselves, and for such as are more sick than we happen to be. And as we cannot but find, that our ability to do this actively and cheerfully is, in a considerable degree, proportionate to our habits of acting for ourselves when on shore, we are taught the importance of not calling on servants for their assistance when on shore, beyond what necessity and propriety plainly require. Our situation gives us an opportunity of acquiring some little branches of knowledge both of men and things, which will not, I hope, be entirely lost; and of continually affording each other accommodations called for by inconveniences, little if ever felt before, which will, I trust, draw more closely the bonds of affection which unite us.

Our present situation has naturally brought some passages ("they that go

down to the sea in ships, &c.") in the Psalms, and St. Paul's voyage and shipwreck, to our minds. What advantages and comforts do we enjoy compared with those who went on the sea in David's, or even in St. Paul's days. Let us never forget who is the donor; or fail to give him the praise! I do not know, that I ever before entered so feelingly into the calamity of the companions of the Apostles, tossed about so many days in an ungovernable ship, and in a very dangerous sea, without any means of ascertaining where they were or whither they were going. St. Paul himself had support from on high, and was informed what he was to expect, but he must have felt much of the pressure of the common misfortune. But this was by no means the only peril by sea which he experienced, as we are told 2 Cor. xi. 25.—"Thrice have I suffered shipwreck. A night and a day have I been in the deep." Looking back on his sufferings, what cause have we to praise God for the easy lot, and the abundant mercies, vouchsafed to us?

Sunday.—Mr. L—— using a profane expression in conversation with me this afternoon, I put a force on myself, and determined to introduce the mention of his present conduct contrasted with his religious education. Fortunately he spoke on the subject himself, when he saw that I was drawing very near it, or at least he was put in mind of his own case by the tenor of my conversation, and candidly applied my remarks to himself. He seemed impressed, but not at all offended, by what passed in our subsequent conversation. May his God and Saviour, who has been so often invoked by the prayers of his father to be his friend and protector, fix the subject of our discourse on his heart; and enable me, if they see it necessary, to contribute, as their humble instrument, to that great end!—Our conversation was interrupted by the Captain.

God blesses us with a fine day and a quiet ship on this his sabbath. The wind continues fair, but light, and we go but about two knots an hour. The sea heaves this morning in smooth and majestic swells, which move forward in easy sweeping curves of much grace and grandeur. They give more motion to the vessel than is comfortable to us. R—— and F—— read me some chapters in Genesis before breakfast, beginning with the twelfth. How trying was Abraham's journey to be a sojourner with his posterity, he knew not how long, in Canaan; and not knowing whither he went, through his entire ignorance of that country! He could neither procure any history to give him any account of it, nor could he even see its figure and position in a map; for he was probably as ignorant of letters, as of delineation for purposes of geography. Probably he might not meet with any travellers, who could give him any comprehensive account of the country and its inhabitants. Yet he went cheerfully in faith, and we hear of no subsequent complaints or regrets in the historywe have of him when in "the strange land;" nor do his spirit and proceedings indicate that he harboured any in his bosom, not even when the gift of the child of promise was so very long delayed. "He sought a better country, that is a heavenly," and this made every sacrifice easy to him, and gave his bosom that peace of God, which passeth understanding, and includes not only content but joy. Alas! that we, under a trial incomparably lighter, and heirs of so much better promises, should find any difficulty in following Abraham's example with undeviating cheerfulness! In whatever sense, or with whatever distinctness of conception as to the nature of his object, he "sought a heavenly country;" there is no doubt, but that this may be said of real Christians, (God grant that we may be such!) in the highest sense, and that we have ample information as to the excellency of our object!

Thank God, we now hear very little swearing except from C——; to whom I must speak, when I have an opportunity. Poor old man! his years and a bad cough ought to give him a near view of the grave. How thankful ought *we* to be, that we have been spared those strong temptations to this vice to which he has probably been exposed, and have enjoyed great and precious advantages of various kinds, which have not been vouchsafed to him. Such deplorable examples should lead us to see and

lament the evils of our own nature, and not to be high-minded, but to fear.

I am now preparing letters for my friends, that I may lose no time in sending them, if an opportunity should occur. How pleasant is it to have a little intercourse with them through the powers of imagination and of the pen, when at the distance of three or four thousand miles! This is a blessing, which a very small portion of the human race can enjoy; a blessing to be prized as productive of present pleasure, and what is more important, as fostering that affection toward our relations and friends which the spirit of Christianity requires, no less than its precepts.

Tuesday.—The crew have, for some days, been busily employed in making new sails. They go through this business in all its parts with great adroitness, sitting on the deck like professed tailors, and handling their needles in sewing together the lengths of canvas, and in fixing the edges of the sail to the ropes which serve as binding to it. Mr. L— tells me this skill in sail-making is an indispensable qualification in a good sailor. This accounts for the prisoners at Orleans turning their hands so readily to the making of trowsers when Mr. L—— was there. I spoke this evening to C—— about his profane language; he listened kindly, and professed intentions of reformation.

Saturday.—After going about thirty miles during the night, the sailors soon after sunrise announced land. Thanks to the great Lord of winds and waves, that our voyage appears to be so near its close, without any serious calamity, and with many, very many blessings.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HOPE you will excuse my disapproving of the following passage, in your otherwise instructive history of the Life of Simon Peter:—"His imagination fervid, his heart feeling, his passions strong, his spirit bold and decisive, he was ever prompt to speak and to act; but from such a modification of character, he was too frequently *betrayed into faults* which are seen and *avoided* by minds *little capable of those generous feelings*, which flourished in the heart of Simon." (Vol. I. p. 145.) These words seem to recommend a temper, which, I am sure, from the usual tenor of your writings, you will be the first to discountenance. Their impropriety strikes me, perhaps, more forcibly than it may others, from, I will not say, an exactly parallel passage which I met with in a sermon, viz. "That mind which is too timorous to sink to a vice, will never soar to a virtue." H. O.

*** We own the justice of H. O's censure.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

LXXXIII. *Unity the Bond of Peace.*

(Continued from p. 163.)

THE two next chapters are occupied in considering "the means of checking the progress of schism;" first, as they respect the clergy; and secondly, as they respect the laity.

With respect to the clergy, the author says,

"Totally blind must they be to their own interest, as well as to the high and important ends of their appointment, if they did not at this time see the peculiar need of professional exertion and personal circumspection. Great would be the wo which would belong to them, if, through any indolence, neglect, or misconduct of theirs, the impending danger be hastened or increased." (p. 183.)

In a subsequent page, he says,

"If, in those places only where the clergy have been wanting in their duty or character, Sectarism had gained a footing, it would have excited no great degree of surprise, nor should we then have had much occasion to complain. But the instances of this kind, I hope, are few, and it is not unworthy of remark, that the spirit of proselytism is, in general, there most busy where the clergy are most active in the care of their flock." (p. 185.)

Of the circumstance mentioned in the latter part of this extract, many instances might be referred to; and in not a few instances, this circumstance has led some (not *very* deep reasoners) to infer, that these "most active" clergymen are the greatest promoters of Dissenters. How often is it alleged against

such clergymen, that they are not only Methodists, but the makers of Methodists! The fact is, (and we see no reason for suppressing it,) that when a zealous clergyman has, by his faithful declaration of the council of God, awakened his hearers to some concern for their souls, and some serious thoughts of eternity, they are then rendered attractive objects of the *proselyting spirit* before described; and in the infancy of their religious life, they may be more exposed to the seductions of the separatist, than while they remained in their former state of spiritual deadness. Now if a clergyman, on account of such circumstances, shall be charged with *encouraging schism*, he must submit to the impeachment. At the same time he may, perhaps, venture to ask his accusers, whether, because some of those whom he has awkened to a sense of religion have become Dissenters, he should, therefore, forbear all endeavours to awaken more? It is a question which may fairly be put; and we should be glad to hear how, in such a case, it would be answered.

It may be said, that these clergymen should labour to prevent the alienation of any of their people. They certainly should (and many of them as certainly do,) by every possible justifiable method. But are we to wonder that these endeavours, in some instances, fail to be effectual?

After stating in a general (indeed, rather too general) way, what the clergy should do, in order to support the Church, this author states what they should *not* do: and among the interdicted practices enumerated, is that of joining in any prayer-meetings, where any devotions are used except those which are contained in the common prayer-book. "All," he says, "beyond this is the business of the family or the closet." He allows, however, of private explications and admonitions. Without pretending in this place to discuss the merits or demerits of prayer-meetings, or the legality of a clergyman's attendance at them, we must express our inability to conceive how it happens, that a clergyman, who is within the bounds of his duty and the law when he addresses himself to a fellow-creature, in the name of God, suddenly steps beyond the limits of his duty and the law, when he seeks for a blessing upon his advice, by addressing himself to God in behalf of his fellow-creature.

The 188th and 189th pages contain some very incorrect reasoning. For example, it is inferred, that if a clergyman, from motives of upright policy, follow the example of the Sectaries in one instance, he *must* follow it in others, through *all* its devious courses. This is not true: he need not do any such thing. Again, the author (if we do not mistake him) represents a clergyman's institution of religious societies, (similar to those which Dr. Woodward has described,) as parallel with field-preaching, and as constituting a desertion of his post. (See last number, p. 163.)

In speaking of those clergymen who are denominated *evangelical*, the author shews that his evident good sense, and apparent conscientiousness, have not preserved him from adopting prejudices, and crediting vulgar clamours, which it would have better become him to have rejected. The consequence of his having attended to them, and suffered himself to be influenced by them, appears in several instances of inconsistency between his declared principles and his practice. Thus he intimates an inability to distinguish one part of the clergy from another, and blames others for making a distinction; yet he adopts the distinction, in order to censure that part which is called evangelical, and to praise the remainder. He deems it indecent in one part of the clerical body, to assume a right of judging others; yet he exercises this right, in sitting in judgment upon the very men whom he would disfranchise. He uses the same kind of language, exercises the same precipitate judgment, and pronounces the same indiscriminate and unsupported censures, with respect to that part of the clergy, to whom the name of evangelical is given, which, when applied to the other part, he very pointedly reprobates.

He also allows, that the distinction between those preachers who are evangelical in their doctrine, and those who are not so, is supported by the authority of Secker, and other great names; and

yet, in the same paragraph, he represents this distinction as not resting upon any other authority than that of the Sectaries. (p. 190.)

In the 195th page, this writer introduces a warm eulogy on the clergy of the establishment. If (as we more than fear) it be not true *so extensively* as he states it, (for it is expressed without limitation or exception,) we earnestly wish that it were: yet we dare not expect so much, unless the ministers of the Church were selected from some more perfect order of beings, than the fallen sons of Adam. The eulogy, however, before us is literally true of many, very many of this justly respected body: and if it be not allowed to be correct, as a representation of what all the clergy are, it must be admitted to be, in many particulars, an excellent delineation of what all the clergy ought to be.

Before we close this subject, we feel it to be our duty, as friends to the permanent respectability of the clergy, and more especially as friends to truth, to express our decided disapprobation of that incautious zeal which assumes for granted, what cannot even be hoped for; and asserts as unquestionable, what never can be proved; and thus affords our adversaries an opportunity of discrediting our general statement, by shewing that it is incorrect in some certain particulars. It is a part of sound discretion, as well as honesty, not to assert too much.

In speaking against the pretensions of enthusiasts to peculiar gifts of inspiration, the writer has left us in doubt whether he believes, that any divine aid or influence is vouchsafed to the ministers of the Gospel, in the execution of their public ministry.

The remainder of this chapter is employed in recommending to the clergy to give a greater portion of their attention to the origin and constitution of the Church, as a means to preserve its unity, and promote the ends of its institution; and in reproving them, for seldom introducing the subject of Church Unity into the pulpit, for being afraid to vindicate their doctrines or to dwell upon the excellence of their liturgy, for taking no other pains to train up the young in the principles of the Church than that of teaching them its catechism, and for leaving both them and their elders unacquainted with the grounds of their connexion with the Church, and uninformed of the sin and consequences of schism.

The omission here complained of, is a serious one. It is one which has long called, and now calls more imperiously than ever, for diligent discreet and conscientious reparation. But while we vindicate our Church, assert its apostolic origin, and maintain both the legitimacy of its discipline, and the purity of its doctrines and services; let us ever guard against the indulgence of a spirit unworthy of so just and sacred a cause. It would be easy (we shall however forbear) to point to existing examples, which might serve as *cautions*, of men who, professing to uphold the Church, disgrace it by the virulence of their language; and, but for better supports, would destroy it by the precipitation of their fury and the blindness of their zeal.

The last chapter of the work which we are considering, relates to "the means to check the progress of Schism as they respect the *Laity*;" whom the author justly represents as bound to take a part in the preservation and defence of the Church. This part he considers as it respects,

First. Their own attachment and example; and

Secondly. The more active assistance that it may be in their power to give.

It is argued, that their attachment should be *firm*, formed upon *principle* and *conviction*, which it should be one object of their ministers to impart to them. The pursuit of this subject leads to some reflections, which do credit to the spirit of their author, and well deserve citation. He says, (p. 213,)

"Far be it from the wish of any friend to civil or religious liberty to see the bounds of toleration so narrowed, as to hurt the feelings of the conscientious Christian, who, from conviction or the prejudices of education, might not be able to unite in doctrine or worship with the national church. The scruples of the sincere and conscientious dissenter are ever to be respected; and greatly to be deprecated as all dissenters are, and much as it must be the wish of every friend to

harmony and peace to see the whole body of Christians of one mind, it is not at the price of their liberty, or that any man should have to complain of coercion in this respect."

There is much reason for the remark, that

"With respect to schisms already existing, a distinction is to be observed between those who first made them, and those whose education and habits have since attached them to their respective societies; and between these and others who should at this time leave the church to join themselves to such societies." (p. 215.)

With equal justice of discrimination, it is observed, that

"It is one thing to be liberal, and another to be quite indifferent; one thing to be fair and candid in our opinion of others, and another to have none of our own; one thing to be free from bigotry and the narrow spirit of party prejudice, and a very different thing to be so little concerned for our church, and so little attached to its interests, as to be ready to give it up with as much ease and indifference as if it were the change of a fashion, or a mere matter of common civility and complaisance." (p. 218.)

We sincerely unite with this author in disapprobation of those, who merely because the *manner* of preaching, used by their parish minister, may not be such as they approve,* his voice not so strong or so melodious as another's, his compositions less eloquent, or his delivery less animated, leave the church, and go elsewhere in search of a preacher more to their taste. (p. 222.) When, however, it is said of a clergyman, "his must be the opinions and doctrines of the church," we are utterly at a loss to assign to these words, in the connection in which they stand, any meaning, which is reconcileable to common sense or general experience. Moreover, when the author says, that the articles are allowed to be strictly evangelical, and "that these are the doctrines which the clergy are obliged to preach;" we cannot help asking, whether he means that this obligation to preach these evangelical doctrines is such, that in consequence of it *all* the clergy (for on *all* the *obligation* lies) *do* preach these doctrines. If he do not mean this, his assertion is perfectly nugatory with respect to the point to which he applies it.

Among the means which are suggested, in this chapter, to the laity, for the prevention of schism, and support of the church, a due pre-eminence is given to that of a holy and righteous life.

"It is not (says the author) enough to remain the nominal members, or even the zealous friends of the church; they must, if they wish to give it effectual support, do credit to it by their own exemplary discharge of all the duties which that relation requires and implies." (p. 231.)

It is unnecessary for us to praise the good sense and just discrimination, which mark the following excellent observations respecting separatists.

"While we condemn their needless separation, the uncharitableness of their zeal, the mischief that they do to the cause of religion by making divisions among us, and the methods which they take to oppose the church from which they divide, it is to be remembered, that it is not their zeal when rightly directed; it is not the strictness of their piety, it is not their keeping holy the sabbath day, or being more attentive to the duties of devotion then, or at other times; it is not their concern for the salvation of their souls; it is not their abstaining from the gratifications which are pursued with so much avidity by the world, though they should carry their scruples even to excess, that the friend of religion ever can blame. A distinction must be made between their piety and their irregularity, their devotion and the means they take to express it; and if they exceed us in the measure, we should rather imitate than condemn them in this. The greater concern which they express for their souls should be our example, rather than the subject of scorn or blame. All that the member of our church has to avoid, is the error into which it carries them, of leaving that church where all that is wanting to make them perfect in the knowledge, and secure in the means of salvation, may be had, without incurring the sin of schism, and doing so much mischief to the cause of true religion." (p. 236.)

We apprehend that this writer goes rather too far, and exceeds the warrant either of scripture or experience, when he engages, that the staunch churchman, who, while warmly pious and highly zealous, avoids enthusiasm and irregularity, shall escape the imputation of methodism, and every other

* On this point the author is at issue with Dr. Croft. (Christian Observer, vol. II. p. 173.)

stigma or censure. We could produce many living proofs of the contrary.

The remaining pages of the volume contain an animated appeal to the lay-members of the church, reproaching them for their past inactivity, and stimulating them to future zeal. Many passages here occur, which well deserve to be extracted; but the length to which our remarks have already extended, forbids any further quotations. We shall, therefore, hasten to close our account of this work, which certainly contains much that is excellent, on a subject that is highly important. The author, in inculcating unity, and discouraging dissension, argues upon the broad principles of Christian duty; and while he explicitly states that schism is a sin, he soberly forbears to abandon all schismatics to the desperate chance of "uncovenanted mercy." He is (in our opinion) mistaken on some points of considerable importance; and his zeal for the church, being in one or two instances directed, by common prejudices, against wrong objects, has led him to treat as foes to the establishment, those who are among its warmest and best friends. The annals of military warfare record several instances of the disastrous consequences which have arisen, from two parties of the same army mistaking each other in the dark for enemies. We cannot but anxiously deprecate the commission of a similar error, by the zealous defenders of our church.

LXXXIV. *Discourses on the scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice: with additional Remarks on the principal Arguments advanced, and the Mode of Reasoning employed by the Opponents of those Doctrines, as held by the Established Church, and an Appendix, containing some Strictures on Mr. Belsham's Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Treatise.* By the Reverend WILLIAM MAGEE, D. D. Senior Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Mathematics, in the University of Dublin, &c. &c. 8vo. pp. 452. Cadell and Davis, 1801. Price 9s. in boards.

THIS work treats of a subject on which the true believer in Christianity must feel a lively interest; and we have pleasure in saying, that it is here handled with an ability of which no cause need to be ashamed. It is long since the press has produced any very profound theological composition: distinguished erudition seems, of late years, to have generally chosen other topics for the exercise of its powers; but here we find it consecrated to the service of *the faith once delivered to the saints*. We hope that the example of our author will be followed by other eminent scholars, and that subjects of the last importance to mankind will not be left entirely to writers of an inferior order.

The work opens with a general view of the means of obtaining reconciliation with God, which Christianity sets before us, and after noticing the likelihood that such a plan would be rejected by the wisdom of this world on its first promulgation, the author adverts to the treatment which it still receives from that quarter.

"Do we not see," says he, "the haughtiness of lettered scepticism, rejecting the proffered terms of salvation, because it cannot trace with the finger of human science, the connexion between the cross of Christ and the redemption of man? But to these vain and presumptuous aspirings after knowledge placed beyond human reach, we are commanded to preach CHRIST CRUCIFIED; which however it may, to the self-fancied wise ones of this world, appear foolishness, is yet, to those who will humble their understanding to the dispensations of the Almighty, the grandest display of the divine perfections—*Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God.*" (p. 3.)

After this introduction, Dr. Magee begins the argumentative part of his discourses, by first replying to the objections of the Deist against the mediatorial scheme. The objector is reminded, that neither our experience of the constitution and course of nature, nor the conclusions of abstract reasoning, correspond with his favourite dogma; that repentance and amendment of life will place him who has violated his duty, in the same situation as if he had never offended.

"The man, for instance, who by intemperance and voluptuousness, has injured his character, his fortune, and his health, does not find himself instantly restored to the full enjoyment of these blessings on repenting of his past misconduct, and determining on future amendment." (p. 5.)—And "If obedience be at all times our duty, in what way can present repentance release us from the

punishment of former transgressions? Can repentance annihilate what is past? or, can we do more by present obedience, than acquit ourselves of present obligation? or, does the contrition we experience, added to the positive duties we discharge, constitute a surplusage of merit, which may be transferred to the reduction of our former demerit?" (p. 7.)

Some faint hope of mercy being extended to the penitent, might, indeed, be excited by the bare contemplation of God's goodness.

"But the animating certainty of this momentous truth, without which the religious sense can have no place, must be derived from the express communication of the Deity alone." (p. 8.)

This last observation our author has illustrated by a long and most interesting note (p. 90,) in which the prevalence of human sacrifices, and other costly and horrid rites in the heathen world, is deduced from unquestionable authorities; and from which, and other circumstances, it is manifest, that *terror* was the predominant feature in the religion of the Gentiles; as it was natural it should be, "from a consciousness of sin unrelieved by any information as to the means of escaping its effects." Another objection against the mediatorial scheme is then considered. Admitting, says the unbeliever, the necessity of a revelation on this subject, yet why must so circuitous a course as the Christian scheme of redemption be adopted? The purpose intended might have been effected in a more simple and intelligible way, "merely by proclaiming to mankind a free pardon, on condition of repentance and amendment." (p. 9.)

Here, as on the former argument, the objector is cautioned against cavilling at a procedure which God has evidently adopted in other things. It has pleased him to ordain a circuitous method of obtaining our food; though it cannot be doubted, that he might have supplied our wants in what the Deist would call *a more simple way*, as he did when he rained down manna in the wilderness. God likewise may have a *great variety* of purposes to answer by the methods he chooses to adopt; and it becomes not us, who are for the most part ignorant of these several purposes, to object against any particular act of deity, as if like the act of a human agent it was done with only one end in view.

The next objection of the Deist against the notion of a mediator, is drawn from his idea of the divine immutability.

"It is either," says he, "agreeable to the will of God, to grant salvation on repentance, and then he *will* grant it without a mediator; or it is not agreeable to his will, and then a mediator can be of no avail, unless we admit the mutability of the divine decrees." (p. 11.)

But the Deist is not aware, that this reasoning, if it prove any thing, is equally conclusive against prayer, and even against his own notion of the sufficiency of repentance. It is therefore well retorted, by Dr. Magee, that

"If it be fit that our sins should be forgiven, God will forgive us without repentance; and if it be unfit, repentance can be of no avail." (p. 12.)

Our author having answered the deistical caviller, proceeds to the more immediate design of his publication, which is to maintain the Christian doctrine of atonement against the objections of *modern Unitarians*. Dr. Magee begins with giving a general view of the opinions of this sect; and it is curious to observe, how thin the partition is which divides them from the Deists. The leading principles of the unitarian system are fairly stated, and the result of the statement is that "*Christianity is nothing but a new and more formal promulgation of the religion of nature.*" p. 14.)

It is alleged, indeed, by the advocates of this system, that the certainty of pardon on repentance is now made known. But granting that this assurance was the only intention of the Christian dispensation, it surely "remains to be considered," as our author observes, "in *what way* that repentance was likely to be brought about." Here follow some impressive remarks on the experienced inefficacy, in humbling the heart of fallen man, of all other considerations, except those which the true Christian doctrines enforces.

"What is the history of man from the creation to the time of Christ, but a continued trial of his natural strength? and what has

been the *moral* of that history, but that man is strong only as he feels himself weak? Strong only as he feels that his nature is corrupt, and from a consciousness of that corruption is led to place his whole reliance upon God." (p. 15.)

By taking a retrospective view of what both the scriptures and profane history teach us concerning the corruption of human nature, Dr. Magee shews that the unitarian hypothesis, like all other erroneous schemes, by whatever name distinguished, does not meet the exigencies of guilty and degenenerate man. Happily, however, there is an adequate resource pointed out to him, in the plain and unforced dictates of revelation. Our author's principal object is to defend their genuine sense against those unitarian writers, whose great labour it is to pervert it: for, strange to say, they profess to retain the notion of a redemption through Jesus Christ; nay, they sometimes speak of an atonement. It is no easy matter, however, to form an exact idea of what they mean, when they use these terms. They use them as men that are unable to get rid of them, and yet know not what to do with them.

Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, seems to have written his *Key to the Apostolic Writings* with the charitable intention of enabling his brethren to adapt these terms to a system, to which they have not the least affinity. If Dr. Taylor has not succeeded, it is to be attributed to the impracticability of the undertaking; not to the want of ingenuity in the attempt, which is very justly described by our author, as "nothing more than an artificial accommodation of scripture phrases, to notions utterly repugnant to scripture doctrine." The reader will find the outlines of Dr. Taylor's perplexing work, in note 16, p. 120, of the volume before us.

The first objection against the doctrine of atonement which our author considers, is that which represents it as founded on the *divine implacability*. Dr. Magee has here, with great propriety, disencumbered himself of those positions, which a few injudicious writers on the orthodox side have advanced: and which the adversaries of the doctrine have charged all who hold it with maintaining. Dr. Magee does not contend, that the sacrifice of Christ made God placable, but he views it "as the *means* appointed by divine wisdom, by which to bestow forgiveness." The reply to the objection is first made with a view to those, who substitute the doctrine of mere *intercession* in place of *atonement*; and who, he observes, carry no point by such a substitution; the charge of ascribing implacability to the Divine Being, attaching as much to their schemes as to ours. The charge itself, however, is denied; nothing more being contended for, than that the sacrifice of Christ is the *means* whereby God has thought fit to grant his favour and gracious aid to repentant sinners.

The second objection is thus expressed. "In what way can the death of Christ, considered as a sacrifice of expiation, be conceived to operate to the remission of sins, unless by the appeasing a being who otherwise would not have forgiven us?" To this objection, which is shewn like the former, to be as much opposed to their scheme who ground the hope of forgiveness on the intercession, as to their's who found it on the atonement of Christ, our autor's answer is,

"I know not, nor does it concern me to know, *in what manner* the sacrifice of Christ is connected with the forgiveness of sins: it is enough that this is declared by God to be the medium, through which my salvation is effected. I pretend not to dive into the counsels of the Almighty. I submit to his wisdom; and I will not reject his grace, because his mode of vouchsafing it is not within my comprehension." (p. 27.)

We highly commend the prudent caution which Dr. Magee has exercised, in not adventuring into any *a priori* reasoning on this profound subject; and we hope his example will be imitated by all who have occasion to instruct others in this fundamental point of Christianity. We fully agree with him in the following sentiment: "That men *could* not have been forgiven, unless Christ had suffered to purchase their forgiveness, is no part of the doctrine of atonement as held by the Church of England. What

God *could* or *could not* have done, it presumes not to pronounce. What God declares he has done that merely it asserts, and on his express word alone it is founded." Our readers, however, are not to suppose, because Dr. Magee rests the doctrine in question on the divine appointment, that he considers that appointment as arbitrary, or not supported by its evident tendency to honour God and to humble the sinner.

"It is a public declaration of God's *holy displeasure* against sin, and of his *merciful compassion* for the sinner; and on the part of the offender, when offered by or for him, it implies a sincere *confession of guilt*, and a hearty desire of obtaining *pardon*." (p. 41.)

Some of the opposers of the doctrine of atonement, having had the hardiness to appeal to scripture authority in support of their opinions, Dr. Magee proceeds to meet them on that ground: and here, as his present adversaries profess to believe the Bible, one might have entertained some hope, had not experience checked the expectation, that the controversy would be soon settled. But let not the unwary reader be deceived by their professions. Let him look into note 14, page 115, of the work before us, and he will see what they mean by scripture authority. What they appeal to is not the plain unsophisticated language of scripture, but scripture interpreted by their own abstract notions of right—Scripture cut down and pared away by those convenient tools, of which scepticism well understands the use, and by means of which the text is disencumbered of all such passages as oppose their views. These they throw, without hesitation, into the common receptacle of all refuse matter, either as interpolations, or omissions, or false readings, or mistranslations. What chance of success has he who would press such slashing critics with scripture authority? Nevertheless, as the only hope, though it must be confessed to be a forlorn one, Dr. Magee takes pains to convince them, that the doctrine he maintains is the doctrine of the Bible.

In the class of objections now under consideration, the first that is noticed is the following very hackneyed one, viz. "that it is no where said in scripture, that God is reconciled *to us* by Christ's death, but that we are every where said to be reconciled *to God*." In the English translation of the Bible, there is not indeed such an expression to be found as, "God's being reconciled to us;" while "our reconciliation to God" is frequently mentioned. (p. 29.) But Dr. Magee shews that, in the original Greek, the passages alluded to evidently imply a reconciliation on the part of him to whom the offence has been given, and not merely a change in the disposition of him who gave the offence (p. 132); an interpretation which harmonizes with the whole tenour of holy writ.

But how are the numerous passages to be disposed of, which describe the death of Christ in terms the most unequivocal as a propitiating act? For this difficulty no common effort of criticism is sufficient. The objectors, therefore, have had recourse to one sweeping decision concerning them, by which (as they think) they have got rid of them all. "The several passages," say they, "which seem to speak this language, contain nothing more than *figurative allusions*." Bold and happy stroke! provided the decision could be maintained. But the arguments by which it is attempted to uphold this decision, have been completely overthrown by Dr. Magee, (p. 34 to 38,) the whole of whose reasoning on this subject we should have been glad, had our limits allowed us to transcribe.

Dr. Magee has enriched this part of his work with a great number of notes, some of which are drawn out to such a length, as to deserve the name of discourses rather than annotations. These appendages to the reasoning contained in the sermon discover such deep research, yield so much valuable information, and afford so many helps in the refutation of error, as in themselves alone to constitute a most valuable treasure of biblical learning, of which every Christian scholar ought to be possessed. In them the author has pursued his opponents through all the tortuous methods of argumentation, by which they have laboured to evade the doctrine of the holy scriptures on the

important point in question. Of the importance of these notes to the controversy in hand, an idea may be formed by mentioning the subjects of some of them; viz. The figurative language of the scriptures; Authorities from the works of eminent Jewish writers, in proof of their holding the notion of expiatory sacrifice; Proofs, that the paschal lamb was offered as a sacrifice; Proofs, that the legal atonements extended to some moral offences as well as ceremonial incapacities; The vicarious import of the piacular offerings under the law, &c. Some of the notes are criticisms on words and phrases of great consequence to the subject; such as, the Greek word ιλασμος, translated *propitiation*; the Hebrew word כפר, the original of the word *atonement* in the Old Testament; and the frequent phrase *for us*, as applied to the death of Christ. Some of them, nor are they the least valuable, are critical observations on important passages of the scriptures. Note 27, page 142, contains a defence of the tenth verse of Isaiah liii, against the positions by which Dr. Priestley endeavours to invalidate its authority. But the most elaborate note is the 43rd, page 225, in which our author, considering the 53rd chapter of Isaiah as a most distinguished testimony in favour of the doctrine of atonement, has strenuously exerted himself to combat the allegations of those, whose system required them to attack the obvious sense of this celebrated prophecy. One of the objects of this note is to remove a difficulty arising from St. Matthew's application of Isaiah liii. 4, to the miraculous cures performed by our Saviour on the sick. See Matt. viii. 17.

To return to our author's text. Having refuted the arguments by which the Unitarian contends for the merely figurative sense of sacrificial language, when used in the scriptures concerning our redemption by Christ, Dr. Magee concludes the first discourse by remarking, that

"In one circumstance the sacrifice of Christ differs from all those sacrifices, which were offered under the law; our blessed Lord was not only the *subject* of the offering, but the *priest* who offered it. Therefore," continues he, "Christ has become not only a sacrifice but an intercessor." "We are not only then, in virtue of the *sacrifice*, forgiven, but in virtue of the *intercession* admitted to favour and grace, and thus the scripture notion of the sacrifice of Christ includes every advantage, which the advocates for the pure intercession seek from their scheme of redemption, but it also contains others, which they necessarily lose by the rejection of that notion. It contains the great advantage of impressing mankind with a *due* sense of their guilt, by compelling a comparison with the immensity of the sacrifice made to redeem them from its effects. It contains that, in short, which is the soul and substance of all Christian virtue, HUMILITY." (p. 42, 43.)

We fear that there is too much truth in what follows the words above quoted.

"The fact is plainly this, that in every attempt to get rid of the scripture doctrine of atonement, we find feelings of a description opposite to this evangelic quality more or less to prevail. We find a fondness for the opinion of man's own sufficiency, and an unwillingness to submit with devout and implicit reverence to the sacred word of revelation." (p. 43.)

We must reserve the Review of the Second Sermon for our next Number.

LXXXV. *Substance of the Speech of the* Right Honourable SIR WILLIAM SCOTT, *in the House of Commons, relative to the Non-residence of the Clergy.* Rivington 1802.

THE monstrous principles which have spread far and wide on the continent, and the disastrous events which have flowed from them, have served to add to the general admiration of the civil branch of our constitution; but we do not know, whether the advantages we have derived from its ecclesiastical branch have been sufficiently valued, and every attack on the bulwarks of it watched with sufficient jealousy, and resisted with becoming vigour.

At the period of the reformation our ancestors were sensible that the evils of Popery, from which they had escaped, arose principally from the two following circumstances. The Romish clergy looked up to the Pope and general councils for their divinity, rather than to the scriptures; and they looked up to ecclesiastical law, and ecclesiastics, as their oracles in judicial affairs, rather than to the common law and the lay courts. In order to avoid the rocks on which their forefathers had split, they framed a constitution for the

Protestant Church, which should not leave it in the power of any bishop to eclipse or rival the scriptures as the fountain of truth; and which should place ecclesiastics, in as great a degree as might be practicable, under the same judicial authority, to which the other subjects of the state were amenable. By this line of conduct they secured Christianity against one great source of corruption; the state against the danger of giving to a very important class of its subjects separate interests and views from the great mass of the community; and the clergy from being deprived of that equal liberty, which their fellow subjects enjoy, and from being degraded by the servility and the corrupt practices, which had been fostered in the Romish clergy by their almost exclusive dependence on their ecclesiastical superiors.

These preliminary observations on the principles of our ecclesiastical constitution appeared to be necessary, before we called the attention of our readers to the speech made in the last Session of Parliament, by the Right Honourable mover of a bill on the subject of clerical residence; as we conceived the tendency of that measure, as well as of the arguments by which it was supported on the part of Sir William Scott, to have been to depart from the Protestant system of establishing the empire of the common law over the clergy, and of extending to them all the blessings of British freedom; and to introduce in its place a system founded on principles very like those of popery. Far be it from us to impute any such intentions to the very respectable Baronet who introduced the bill; but the tendency of his measure, and of the arguments in support of it, which are contained in the publication now under review, are fair subjects of temperate animadversion, particularly as the momentous question is again about to be submitted to Parliament.

It was the chief object of the bill to which we allude, to take the clergy, in a very great measure, out of the courts of common law, and place them under the discretion of the bishops, in every thing which regards their residence on their livings. Sir William Scott intimates very plainly (page 8), that he should have been disposed to take away the jurisdiction of the law courts in cases of residence altogether, if he had not paid a deference to the established practice of his country: and he supports his measure by arguments, which, if valid, would make it an imperious duty to withdraw the clergy from the lay courts, and place them entirely under the bishops, not only in cases of residence, but in so many other cases, that it is difficult to say what jurisdiction those courts would retain over the clergy, or what bounds would be placed to exclusive episcopal jurisdiction.

Those arguments we will now proceed to notice. In page 8 of his speech, Sir William Scott argues against the parliament of Henry VIII. giving jurisdiction to the lay courts in cases of residence, as a violent innovation on the practice of the Church. If the practice of the Church of Rome is to be good authority in determining what system of polity we shall pursue with regard to the Church of England, all our peculiar principles as Protestants must be given up. It will be idle to dispute the ground with the Papists, when we have no arms left; we had better shake hands with them at once, and return to their communion. Sir William Scott speaks also of the practice of other Churches. But not to insist on other strong objections to his reasoning on this head, it may be sufficient to remark, that as Britons will not exchange their civil, so neither will they, we trust, their ecclesiastical polity, in deference to the usages of all the nations on the face of the globe.

The Right Honourable Baronet (page 15), speaks as if having recourse to the common law were an insult to the bishop. He says, that the bishop is dethroned, and the common informer put in his place. This is a sweeping argument. Those who are wiser than we are, must affix limits to its application. We hope, and trust, that the King of England does not look upon himself as dethroned, when the

duties of his subjects, and even of his ministers, are defined and enforced by penal statutes. It will not be contended, that the dignity of bishops is of a higher stamp than that of the king, or that they will be less ready than he to pay a cheerful deference to the wisdom and authority of the law of the land.

But the clergy, it seems, ought not to be amenable to the lay courts in cases of non-residence, because that will degrade the clerical order. (page 52.) When we see such an argument used by such a character, we are tempted to doubt whether we have not mistaken the genius of the British constitution. Do we live in a country where the dominion of the law is supreme and universal over all persons, however elevated they may be, with the single exception of the sovereign? Does the dignity of the highest peer exempt him from its authority? With what decency then can a claim of exemption on this ground be made in favour of the clergy? We are certain that, if their modesty would permit them to make such a claim, they partake too much of the feelings of Englishmen to be disposed to advance it. They are fully convinced, that the interests and the dignity of every class in society are best supported, by all classes being subject to one equal and impartial system of law; and, as members of the community, they can have no ambition beyond sharing with their fellow citizens all the benefits, and all the burdens, of the British constitution. Sir William Scott thinks it but reasonable, that all matters of ecclesiastical discipline should be left to the regulation of ecclesiastics, and he considers the case of residence as one of them, (pages 8—11.) In support of this opinion he refers, not only to the practice of the Catholic and other Churches, but to that of other professions, "the peculiar duties of which," he says, "are enforced not in the ordinary course of judicial proceeding, but in forums of their own, and in a course of official administration confided to the vigilance and integrity of their respective superiors." (p. 9, 10.)

On this head we would remark, first, that we do not think, that all matters of ecclesiastical discipline (in Sir William Scott's wide sense of that term,) ought to be left to ecclesiastics. Their peculiar duties will be best enforced, and their characters and fair fame best maintained, by the vigilant superintendance of the community in which they live, and of its courts and magistrates. Clerical residence, it is also to be observed, stands on peculiar grounds; livings having originally been endowed with a glebe and tythes, partly by the parishioners, and partly by the bishop, for the express purpose of securing the residence of the clergyman.*

But it is not, as we apprehend, the policy of our law to leave the conduct of individuals of other professions, in cases similar to that of clerical residence, to the superintendance of their respective superiors; but to make them amenable to its ordinary courts. If gentlemen of the profession of medicine, or of the law, undertake business, which they neglect to perform, they are liable to action. And when a clergyman undertakes the care of a parish, and is in the actual enjoyment of an income settled upon his predecessors and himself, in order to ensure his residence, why should he not be liable to action also, if he is faithless to his trust?

The principle avowed by Sir William Scott, of withdrawing the clergy from the lay courts, and leaving their professional conduct entirely to the controul of their superiors in the Church, tends likewise, in our opinion, to separate Church and State, and bring back a share of the evils of popery.

But Sir William Scott adduces two other arguments in favour of his measure, which appear to us truly alarming to all who love British law and British liberty; for he argues for withdrawing cases of clerical residence from the ordinary courts, because those courts adhere to unbending rules of law; and because in them prosecutors are

* See a late pamphlet by Dr. Napleton.

stimulated by pecuniary rewards to proceed against offenders.

His objections, under the first of these heads (pages 14, 46—48), he wishes to be considered as restricted to cases to which general rules are not applicable. But his mode of reasoning would include, under this description, such a vast variety of cases, to which rules of law are now applied, that, if the legislature were to adopt it, our legal system would be so mutilated as to be no longer the safeguard of private rights or of public freedom: for what are the circumstances which Sir William Scott insists upon, in order to shew that rules of law cannot be applied to the case of clerical residence? The great differences as to income, family, habits of life, education, and attainments, which exist among the clergy. These, however, are no other than the ordinary disparities of human life in such a state of society as ours. In the framing of laws, no doubt, they demand much consideration and attention; but if they afforded sufficient ground for giving up the rules of law altogether, and depending entirely on episcopal discretion, in the case of residence, they would also call for a similar procedure in a hundred other instances among the clergy; and if they were valid causes for adopting this course in clerical, why not also in lay concerns? The tenderness for which Sir William Scott pleads towards the clergy, whom he appears to look upon as formed of materials too delicate to be subjected to "the iron hand of the law," ought surely to be extended to the laity also, who are of the same flesh and blood with their clerical brethren. In short, where would innovation stop, and what portion of the British constitution would remain to us, if our legislature should act on the principle, that magisterial discretion must supersede law, in cases where the inequalities of fortune, &c. mentioned by Sir William Scott, cause the rules of law to bear unequally on different individuals? The fact is, that general rules are so modified and limited in the framing of our laws, as to meet the various cases to which the disparities in human life give birth, with a precision sufficient for practical purposes, though certainly not sufficient to silence all the objections of the theorist; and we doubt not but a law, to which this character would justly apply, might be easily framed on the subject of clerical residence.

If, however, all Sir William Scott's arguments with respect to the non-applicability of rules of law, were answered to his satisfaction, we know not how he could get over his objections to the mode in which penal statutes are made operative, namely, by holding out a general stimulus to all, to inform against and prosecute those who violate them. He speaks in very severe terms, of a common informer (p. 56), &c. and he scruples not (p. 52) to apply this title to the bishop himself, if he should prosecute any of his clergy in a court of law; and in pages 2, 3, 15, he openly avows his opinion, that our legislature has been entirely wrong in its policy of holding out, in its penal statutes, rewards to prosecutors. We really do not know where to begin in our remarks on this line of argument. Do we love and esteem our judicial system, or do we not? If we do, let us reject, as we ought, a mode of reasoning which must, if adopted, overturn it. Can penal statutes be carried into effect without prosecutions? and will the experience of mankind warrant a hope, that prosecutions will take place, if prosecutors are not liberally indemnified, and even more than indemnified, for their trouble and expense? Sir William Scott's argument, therefore, holds no parley with penal statutes, whether they apply to the clergy or to the laity, and would require that they should be swept away. Whether Englishmen are willing to follow the learned Baronet in this course, and substitute magisterial discretion, the distinguishing feature of despotism, for known and determinate rules of law, which are essential to liberty and its great safeguard, let them judge.

But suppose this were done, would the magistrates be able to punish crimes without being informed of them? Informers must, therefore, have place in the new system; and we fear too, that

it would still be found as necessary to stimulate them to act by pecuniary motives. The difference would be, that under the new system their information would be secret, and their pay secret; and its amount often dictated by the spirit of favouritism, or the humour of the moment; instead of the first being given in the face of the public, and the amount of the last settled on general grounds by an enlightened legislature.

Should the bishops be invested with the powers Sir William Scott would give them, with respect to clerical residence, can *they* act without information from those who know the cases under consideration, and the parties concerned in them? If they do, they must act in the dark, on delusive *ex parte* representations: and if they depend on gratuitous information from neighbours of the parties, their own experience of the extreme scantiness of such information in the presentments of churchwardens, and (we are concerned to add) of its frequent incorrectness in the testimonials in favour of candidates for orders, will enable them to judge how far such dependence is rational.

The extent and importance of the subject will plead our excuse for having considered, at so great length, Sir William Scott's reasons for the change he proposed in our clerical system. Instead of weakening our predilection for the good old path which our fathers have trod before us, they have served only to make us adhere to it with increased affection, and pronounce, with more cordial energy, "*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.*"

In our next, we shall make a few remarks on Sir William Scott's estimate of clerical respectability, as it appears in the printed speech which we have now been considering.

LXXXVI. *Paley's Natural Theology.*

(Continued from p. 168.)

In order to place the argument for the existence of a supreme intelligent agent in the most striking point of view, and to avoid the objection of the Atheist, as to our inability to comprehend the manner in which contrivance is exercised in natural operations, Dr. Paley proceeds, in the seventh chapter, to consider the mechanical and immechanical parts and functions of animals and vegetables. The former he justly prefers, as proofs of design, to any powers or principles existing in bodies, the nature and properties of which are not thoroughly understood. The proof arising from mechanical functions is, indeed, one of the plainest and most satisfactory; and if they do not serve to excite the most profound emotions of wonder and admiration at the wisdom and power of God, they more clearly demonstrate the single point of contrivance and design, than many other operations of a more obscure or refined nature, which produce those effects upon the mind. One instance, however, in which, though mechanism cannot be exhibited, or be proved to be employed, yet we want not sufficient evidence to conduct us to the same conclusion, is of so interesting a kind, that, were we not afraid of extending our review to a very disproportionate size, we should have extracted the account of it for the entertainment of our readers. It relates to the operation of the gastric juice, "the chymical wonder of animal nature," in dissolving the texture of all that variety of strange and widely different substances, which find their way into the stomach of animals.

The functions of animal secretion and assimilation are then described; after which, the author proceeds to the examination of the mechanical parts of our frame, as affording the most direct and striking proofs and specimens of design.

Examples of this kind are first taken from *the bones*, the most remarkable of which are those of *the human neck*, and of the *spine* or back-bone. The configuration of *the joints* is next minutely and accurately displayed; uniting in a variety of instances, the suppleness and pliability necessary for the constant exercise of animal functions, with a strength and firmness which preserve them in complete repair and use, notwithstanding the contortions and wrenches to which they are continually subject.

The ninth and tenth chapters contain

a description of the wonderful mechanism, which is exhibited in the action of the muscles, and of the vessels of animal bodies. The observations illustrative of these subjects are remarkably striking, and afford strong proofs of the acuteness and ability of the learned author. We select one which will serve as a specimen of the rich fund of amusement and instruction to be found in these chapters.

"Another exquisite structure is seen in the *larynx*. We all know, that there go down the throat two pipes, one leading to the stomach, the other to the lungs; the one being the passage for the food, the other for the breath and voice: we know also that both these passages open into the bottom of the mouth; the gullet, necessarily, for the conveyance of food; and the windpipe, for speech and the modulation of sound, not much less so: therefore the difficulty was, the passages being so contiguous, to prevent the food, especially the liquids, which we swallow into the stomach, from entering the windpipe, i. e. the road to the lungs; the consequence of which error, when it does happen, is perceived by the convulsive throes that are instantly produced. This business, which is very nice, is managed in this manner. The gullet (the passage for food) opens into the mouth like the cone or upper part of a funnel, the capacity of which forms indeed the bottom of the mouth. Into the side of this funnel, at the part which lies the lowest, enters the windpipe, by a chink or slit, with a lid or flap, like a little tongue, accurately fitted to the orifice. The solids or liquids which we swallow, pass over this lid or flap, as they descend by the funnel into the gullet. Both the weight of the food, and the action of the muscles concerned in swallowing, contribute to keep the lid close down upon the aperture, whilst any thing is passing: whereas, by means of its natural cartilaginous spring, it raises itself a little, as soon as the food is passed, thereby allowing a free inlet and outlet for the respiration of air by the lungs. Such is its structure. And we may here remark the almost complete success of the expedient, viz. how seldom it fails of its purpose, compared with the number of instances in which it fulfils it. Reflect, how frequently we swallow, how constantly we breathe. In a city feast, for example, what deglution, what anhelation! yet does this little cartilage, the epiglottis, so effectually interpose its office, so securely guard the entrance of the windpipe, that, whilst morsel after morsel, draught after draught, are coursing one another over it, an accident of a crumb or a drop slipping into this passage, (which nevertheless must be opened for the breath every second of time,) excites, in the whole company, not only alarm by its danger, but surprise by its novelty. Not two guests are choked in a century." (p. 190—192.)

A curious and detailed account both of the circulation of the blood, and of the apparatus by which it is supplied through the intestines with the digested aliment, is also contained in the tenth chapter.

The eleventh chapter displays various and striking indications of contrivance and design, in the animal structure regarded as a mass, of which, what the learned author has termed *the package*, the property of beauty, and the faculty of standing, are, perhaps, the most curious.

In the twelfth and thirteenth chapters, which are devoted to the consideration of "Comparative Anatomy," and of "Peculiar Organizations," the wisdom of the Creator is traced in the peculiar structure of the different classes of animals, and in the adaptation of each to the various exigencies of its nature and situation. In the former chapter, the description of a feather; in the latter, of the tongue of a woodpecker, is particularly interesting. The provision also which is found in the lungs of birds, for the purpose of levitation, and that of the air-bladder in fishes, are given as plain and direct instances of mechanical contrivance; and such as can be accounted for upon no other supposition, than that of an intelligent designer.

Dr. Paley proceeds in the next chapter to what he calls "prospective contrivances," i. e. the providing of things beforehand, which are not to be used until a considerable time afterwards. This, as he observes, is a distinguishing mark, and, consequently, a certain proof of design; since it implies a contemplation of the future, which belongs only to intelligence.

Of such prospective contrivances we select the following example:

"The eye is of no use, at the time when it is formed. It is an optical instrument made in a dungeon; constructed for the refraction of light to a focus, and perfect for its purpose, before a ray of light has had access to it; geometrically adapted to the properties and action of an element, with which it has no communication. It is about indeed to enter into that communication; and this is precisely the thing which evidences intention. It is *providing* for the *future* in the closest sense which can be given to these terms; for it is providing for a future change: not for the then

subsisting condition of the animal; not for any gradual progress or advance in that same condition; but for a new state, the consequence of a great and sudden alteration, which the animal is to undergo at its birth. Is it to be believed that the eye was formed, or, which is the same thing, that the series of causes was fixed by which the eye is formed, without a view to this change; without a prospect of that condition, in which its fabric, of no use at present, is about to be of the greatest; without a consideration of the qualities of that element, hitherto entirely excluded, but with which it was hereafter to hold so intimate a relation? A young man makes a pair of spectacles for himself against he grows old: for which spectacles he has no want or use whatever at the time he makes them. Could this be done without knowing and considering the defect of vision to which advanced age is subject? Would not the precise suitableness of the instrument to its purpose, of the remedy to the defect, of the convex lense to the flattened eye, establish the certainty of the conclusion, that the case, afterwards to arise, had been considered beforehand, speculated upon, provided for? all which are exclusively the acts of a reasoning mind. The eye formed in one state, for use only in another state, and in a different state, affords a proof no less clear of destination to a future purpose; and a proof proportionably stronger, as the machinery is more complicated, and the adaptation more exact." (p. 277—279)

The fifteenth chapter comprises the subject of "relations," in which, as in examining the several parts of a watch, the learned author points out the fitness or congruity, and the mutual subserviency of the different parts of the same animal, and of its whole structure, to the element or occupation for which it was designed. He observes, that the animal economy is full—is made up of these relations, and illustrates the remark, by the parts and powers which successively act upon the food of all animals, by the general relation which subsists between the external organs of an animal, by which it procures its food, and the internal powers, by which it digests it; and by several other instances of a similar nature. To these *general* relations, two are added which are *particular*, or the relations which subsist between the particular configuration of one or more parts of certain species of animals, and the particular configuration of one or more other parts of the same animal: from these, had our limits permitted us, we should have been happy to have gratified our readers by extracting the description of *a mole*, in the various parts of which animal this mutual relation, arising from a subserviency to a common purpose, namely, that of an underground life, are clearly observable.

The author proceeds in the next chapter to what he terms "compensation." "Compensation," he observes, "is a species of relation. It is relation when the defects of one part, or of one organ, are supplied by the structure of another part or of another organ:" as when "the short unbending neck of the elephant is compensated by the length and flexibility of his proboscis."—(p. 298.)

"The works of the Deity are known by expedients. Where we should look for absolute destitution, where we can reckon up nothing but wants, some contrivance always comes in to supply the privation. A *snail*, without wings, feet, or thread, climbs up the stalks of plants, by the sole aid of a viscid humour discharged from her skin. She adheres to the stems, leaves, and fruits of plants, by means of a sticking plaister. A *muscle*, which might seem, by its helplessness, to lie at the mercy of every wave that went over it, has the singular power of spinning strong tendinous threads, by which she moors her shell to rocks and timbers. A *cockle*, on the contrary, by means of its stiff tongue, works for itself a shelter in the sand. The provisions of nature extend to cases the most desperate." (p. 306.)

Of this the annual mutation which the lobster undergoes, furnishes a curious and wonderful instance, which we should have willingly extracted for the amusement of our readers, had our limits allowed us.

In the 17th chapter, Dr. Paley considers the relation of "animated bodies to inanimate nature." He shews that the bodies of animals hold, in their constitution and properties, a close and important relation to natures altogether external to their own; to inanimate substances, and to the specific qualities of these, e. g. they hold a strict relation to the elements by which they are surrounded. Can it, for instance, be doubted, as the author demands, whether the *wings of birds* bear a relation to air, and the *fins of fish* to water? Again, the structure of the animal *ear* depends for its use, not simply upon being surrounded by a fluid, but upon the specific

nature of that fluid; which observation may also be applied to the *organs* of speech, and voice, and respiration. The adaptation of the *eye* to the element of *light*, is likewise a very remarkable proof of this appropriation. The last relation which is mentioned by the author is that of sleep to *night*; and it is a relation which Dr. Paley shews to have been expressly intended.

"And this relation," as he justly observes, "is the relation of the inhabitants of the earth to the rotation of their globe; probably it is more: it is a relation to the system, of which that globe is a part; and, still further, to the congregation of systems, of which theirs is only one. If this account be true, it connects the meanest individual with the universe itself; a chicken roosting upon its perch, with the spheres revolving in the firmament." (p. 322.)

The next chapter, the eighteenth, comprehends the subject of "instincts," and it is treated in a very able and interesting manner.

An instinct, Dr. Paley defines to be "a propensity prior to experience, and independent of instruction." To suppose that in any part of the process, for example, relating to the incubation of eggs, the bird acts from a sagacity and reason of her own, is, as the author justly contends, to suppose her to arrive at conclusions, which there are no premises to justify. The supposition which has been sometimes made, that what reason could not do for the bird, observation, or instruction, or tradition might, is also shewn to be perfectly without foundation. Dr. Paley lastly, in this chapter, successfully confutes the theory, which resolves instinct into sensation; which asserts, that what appears to have a view and relation to the future, is the result only of the present disposition of the animal's body, and of pleasure or pain experienced *at the time*. Of this theory, he observes, first, that of the cases which require solution, there are few, to which it can be applied with tolerable probability; that there are none, to which it can be applied without strong objections, furnished by the circumstances of the case. Secondly, that, even as to the cases in which the hypothesis has the fairest claim to consideration, it does not at all lessen the force of the argument for intention and design. In a word, the author would say, to the patrons of this opinion,

"Be it so: be it, that those actions of animals which we refer to instinct, are not gone about with any view to their consequences, but that they are attended in the animal with a present gratification, and are pursued for the sake of that gratification alone; what does all this prove, but that the *prospection*, which must be somewhere, is not in the animal, but in the Creator?" (p. 342.)

In the nineteenth chapter, Dr. Paley continues his argument by examining the structure of "insects," which, though less understood than that of quadrupeds and birds, exhibits many contrivances, neither dubious in their use, nor obscure in their structure, and most properly mechanical. Of the numerous examples which the author brings forward to illustrate his argument, the only one which we can venture to select, is that respecting the contrivance by which the gossamer spider supports itself in the air.

"Europe has lately been surprised by the elevation of bodies in the air by means of a balloon. The discovery consisted in finding out a manageable substance, which was, bulk for bulk, lighter than air; and the application of the discovery was, to make a body composed of this substance bear up, along with its own weight, some heavier body which was attached to it. This expedient, so new to us, proves to be no other than what the author of nature has employed in the *gossamer spider*. We frequently see this spider's thread floating in the air, and extended from hedge to hedge, across a road or brook of four or five yards width. The animal which forms the thread, has no wings wherewith to fly from one extremity to the other of this line; nor muscles to enable it to spring or dart to so great a distance. Yet its creator hath laid for it a path in the atmosphere; and after this manner. Though the animal itself be heavier than air, the thread which it spins from its bowels is specifically lighter. This is its *balloon*. The spider left to itself would drop to the ground; but, being tied to its thread, both are supported. We have here a very peculiar provision; and to a contemplative eye it is a gratifying spectacle, to see this insect wafted on her thread, sustained by a levity not her own, and traversing regions, which, if we examined only the body of the animal, might seem to have been forbidden to its nature." (p. 364, 365.)

For a very interesting account of the sting of a bee, and of the relation which obtains between the wax and the honey, we must refer our readers to the work itself.

The next chapter is devoted to the examination of "plants;" and though a designed and studied mechanism is, in general, more evident in animals, the vegetable kingdom is not deficient in affording some remarkable proofs of it. These Dr. Paley collects from the care which appears to be taken in perfecting the *seed* of plants, in *preserving* it until it be perfected, and then in dispersing it. He also notices the provision which is made in the *constitution* of seeds, first, for the safety of the *germ*; secondly, for the temporary support of the future plant. Two observations are further made concerning the vegetable tribe; one of which relates to the remarkable circumstance which takes place in their germination, that if the seed be thrown into the wrongest possible position, that is, if the ends point in the ground the reverse of what they ought to do, every thing nevertheless goes on right. The second observation is upon the long, tapering, spiral tendrils with which climbing plants are exclusively furnished for their support, and which is a property strictly mechanical. Some instances are then added of singular mechanism, or peculiar provision in several species of plants.

The twenty-first chapter relates to the "elements," and contains some acute and judicious observations upon the strict relations which they bear, not only to the constitution of organized bodies, but to each other, affording plain proofs of intelligence and design in their formation.

The next chapter is upon "astronomy," concerning which, so far as it relates to the immediate argument of his work, we fully agree with the learned author, that it is not the best medium through which to prove the agency of an intelligent creator; for though it shews, beyond all other sciences, the magnificence of his operations, yet we want the means of examining the constitution of the heavenly bodies, either as to their *forms* or *motions*.

After all, however, as Dr. Paley afterwards observes, the real subject of admiration is, that we understand so much of astronomy as we do: and it is highly satisfactory to reflect, that amidst the imperfection of our knowledge, and "the confessed desiderata and desideranda, which impede our investigation of the wisdom of the Deity, in the grandest of his works, there are to be found, in the phænomena, ascertained circumstances and laws, sufficient to indicate an intellectual agency in three of its principal operations," viz.

"In choosing, in determining, in regulating: in *choosing*, out of a boundless variety of suppositions which were equally possible, that which is beneficial; in *determining*, what, left to itself, had a thousand chances against conveniency, for one in its favour; in *regulating* subjects, as to quantity and degree, which, by their nature, were unlimited with respect to either." (p. 413.)

A few instances, such as best admitted of popular explication, under each of these heads, are then offered, in the statement of which the atheistical objections of Buffon and other philosophers are fully obviated. But our limits will not allow of our making any extracts.

With this chapter the learned author closes his investigation of the evidences which may be collected from the appearances of nature, of the existence and attributes of the Supreme Being. In those which follow, he proceeds to apply them to the immediate proof of these truths of Natural Theology. But we are under the necessity of deferring our observations upon the concluding chapters, and upon the whole of this work, to a future number.

(To be continued.)

LXXXVII. *Four Sermons, preached in London, at the Eighth General Meeting of the Missionary Society, May* 12th, 13th, 14th, 1802. By the Reverend S. Lowell, Bristol; the Reverend G. Townsend, Ramsgate; the Reverend J. M. Mason, A. M. New York; the Rev. R. Hawker, D. D. Plymouth, pp. 148—Also the Report of the Directors, and a List of Subscribers. 8vo. London, Williams. 1802.

These sermons were delivered with a view to promote the benevolent purposes of the institution named in the title page. This object the several preachers endeavoured to effect, by considerations drawn from the following subjects:—1. The triumphs of Messiah.—2. The glory of Messiah.—

3. Messiah's throne.—4. The work of the Holy Ghost.

Of the first two sermons, little more can be said to justify their being made public, than that it is a rule with the society to print *all* the discourses delivered on their anniversary. As warm effusions, however, in the cause they were meant to serve, we conceive that, with all their blemishes, their effect with many must have been considerable. The other sermons are entitled to greater commendation, having, with equal earnestness, a superiority in their composition. The third sermon deserves particular notice in this view. It needed not the occasion, on which it was preached, to carry it to the press; nor do we conceive that it will be wholly indebted thereto for being preserved, as its merits will, without doubt, secure it from oblivion. The fourth sermon has likewise much to recommend it; but would have had greater force, had it been less diffuse.

The report has been already noticed by us.

LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE, *&c. &c.*

GREAT BRITAIN.

In the press, *Memoirs of the British Peerage*, by Mr. Egerton Brydges.—A *Translation of Apollonius Rhodius*, in three volumes, by Mr. Preston, of Dublin.—A volume of *Sermons*, by Dr. Gleig, of Stirling.—*Travels of Four Years and a Half in the United States of America*, by J. Davis, in one volume, 8vo.—*The Castle of the Tuilleries*, or Narrative of Occurrences in the Interior of that Place, from its Erection to the 18th of Brumaire, year 8; translated from the French, by Francis Lathom, Esq. in two volumes, 8vo.—*Sermons*, by W. L. Brown, D. D. Principal of Mareschal College, &c. &c. Aberdeen, in one volume, 8vo.

The *Abridgment of the Philosophical Transactions*, of which one volume was published last year, is now discontinued, on account of the imperfection of its execution. An *entirely new Abridgment* of the same work has been undertaken by Chas. Hutton, LL D. F.R.S. Mathematical Professor at Woolwich, for the *Philosophical* department; by George Shaw, M.D. F R S. and F.L S for the department of *Natural History*; and Richard Pearson, M.D. F.A.S. for that of *Medicine*.

A *History of Africa*, on an extensive scale, is preparing by Dr. Leyden.

Announced for publication, in four or five numbers, at one guinea each, *A Series of Picturesque Scenery in the Holy Land and Syria*, delineated during the campaigns of 1799 and 1800, by F. B. Spilsbury, under the command of Sir Sidney Smith; with *A Journal to Jerusalem*, by Lieutenant Boxer, and other officers of his Majesty's ship Le Tigre; forming altogether a most interesting picture of the present state of Palestine, and the customs and manners of its inhabitants.

A new edition is in the press of Campbell's *Translation of the Gospels*, in three volumes, 8vo. It will contain many corrections and improvements of the former edition, taken from the author's interleaved copy of that edition.

Mr. Malcolm is proceeding with two more volumes together of his *History of London*.

Mr. Urquhart is printing an *Exposition of the Advantages of Classical Learning*.

The machine for Sweeping Chimneys, invented by Mr. Smart, of Camden Town, which we mentioned in our last number, p. 177, consists of a series of wooden tubes, each of about thirty inches in length and three quarters of an inch in diameter. A rope or cord is run through these tubes, which, fastening into one another at the ends, may be then extended to any length. To the upper tube upon the cord is fastened a square brush, the block of which is about six inches long by three wide; and from it, on all sides, issues heath, broom, or any other stiff, but flexible substance, in sufficient quantity to fill the cavity of the chimney. The ends of the tubes are so fastened into one another, as to leave room for them to play like a joint; by which means the apparatus will bend to the most crooked chimney, and in coming down will clear all the ledges and corners. By this method, a chimney fifty feet high may be swept in six or eight minutes; and with much less dirt than in the usual mode.

It is said, that to preserve rye, and secure it from insects and rats, nothing more is necessary than not to winnow it after being thrashed, but to stow it in the granaries mixed with the chaff. In this state it will keep three or four years without undergoing the smallest alteration, and even without the necessity of being turned to preserve it from humidity and fermentation. Care must, however, be taken not to bring it into the barn till thoroughly dry. The experiment has not yet been made with other kinds of grain, but they may probably be preserved in the chaff with equal advantage.

FRANCE.

It is stated in a late number of the *Moniteur*, that the following copies are sold of the different papers in Paris; of that official paper, 3000; of the *Publiciste*, 2900; of the

Journal de Paris, 2800; of the *Journal des Debats* (which is most favourable to the ancient order of things,) 6000; of the *Clef des Cabinets*, 11,000; of the *Citoyen Francaise*, 1200; of the *Journal des Defenseurs de la Patrie*, 1000; of the *Décade Philosophique*, 900; and of the English newspaper called the *Argus*, 720. Nothing more strongly evinces the degraded state of French literature, and the public opinion of the state of the press under the present government, than these numbers. This country, with an inferior population, and with a language far less generally current in other countries than the French, supports nearly two hundred newspapers, with a circulation of from one to five thousand copies each; besides a multitude of monthly publications, of which similar quantities are sold.

Baron EDELCRANTZ has presented to the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, at Paris, the description of a new lamp, which he calls the *Static Lamp;* and in which, by means of mercury and a weight, the oil is made at pleasure to ascend to any required height and remain at that height.

The new government of Switzerland seems to wish to restore the University of Geneva, the only one in the countries subjected to France peculiarly appropriated to the Calvinists, to its former lustre. Several new professors have been lately appointed—Neckar, De Saussure, and Voucheur, professors of botany; Tingry, of Chemistry; Picot, of Statistics, &c.

ITALY.

A very rich and abundant spring of PETROLEUM or NAPTHA, was discovered a few months since at Amiano, a village in the state of Parma, on the Ligurian confines. The Ligurian government commissioned a learned chemist to analyze it; and it is now employed without mixture of any kind in lighting the city of Genoa. It is extremely limpid; of the colour of white wine; has a very strong pungent smell; but is less empyreumatic than common or brown petroleum. Its specific gravity is to that of water as eighty-three to one hundred, and to that of olive oil as ninety-one to one hundred.

DENMARK.

From the report of the commissioners, appointed by the King of Denmark to promote the introduction of the Vaccine Inoculation, it appears, that at the end of last year, 6489 persons had been inoculated with the cow pox in the Danish dominions.

RUSSIA.

The Emperor of Russia, wishing to encourage the establishments of English Breweries in his dominions, has lately made a grant of lands to M. Potapow for the cultivation of hops. He has for that purpose chosen a situation in the government of Moscow.

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THEOLOGY.

A Sermon on the Depravity of the Human Heart, exemplified generally in the conduct of the Jews, and particularly in that of Lieut. Colonel Despard, previous to his execution, preached St. George's, Hanover-square, Feb. 27, 1803. By William Leigh, LL. B.

Sermons upon subjects interesting to Christians of every denomination. By Thomas Taylor, 8vo.

The Warning Voice; shewing that the Fall of Babylon, denounced by Isaiah, Ezekiel, and St. John, is at hand, and that the Restoration of the Jews is fast approaching.

The mild Tenor of Christianity, 12mo.

Thoughts on the Doctrine of Vicarious Suffering, occasioned by some Reflections on the Bishop of London's Lectures in the Monthly Review for December 1802.

Reflections upon the State of Religion and Christendom, particularly in the countries situated within the limits of the Western Roman Empire, at the commencement of the nineteenth century of the era; in which is contained, a regular paraphrase or explanation of the prophecies contained in the book of Revelations. By Edward Evanson, 8vo.

The Divine Logos; or Jehovah Elohim the only proper object of Christian Worship. By John Bentley.

A Serious Call to a constant and devout attendance on the services of the church. By the Reverend Thomas Robinson.

A Sermon preached before the Society of the Sons of the Clergy in the Diocese of Durham, Sept. 1802. By Thomas Burgess, B.D. 8vo.

Observations on the Speech of Sir William Scott, and other matters relating to the church; in which the fatal consequences of permitting the clergy to hold farms are stated. By a clergyman, 8vo.

Friendly Admonitions to Parents, and the Female Sex in general, with reflections on moral and religious subjects, intended for the benefit of the rising generation. By Charlotte Badger, 8vo.

Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; in which some of the false reasonings, incorrect statements, and palpable misrepresentations contained in the publication "the True Churchman ascertained, by John Overton, A. B." are pointed out. By the Rev. Charles Daubeney.

Andrews's edition of Dr. Watts's Hymns, revised, corrected, abridged, and altered on the principal controversial points; with a selected supplement on practical subjects. Designed as a medium, on evangelical principles, between the extremes which now unhappily prevail.

An Admonition to Parents and Children, chiefly intended for the lower classes of society. By James Cowe, A. M. 8vo.

The Regard which is due to the Memory of Good Men; a Sermon preached at Dundee, February, 1802, on the Death of George Yeaman, Esq. By the Rev. James Bruce, A.B.

MISCELLANIES.

A Brief Epitome of the History of England, calculated to exercise the Memory of the infant Readers of History, three small volumes.

The Sixteenth Volume of Dr. Mavor's Universal History; to be completed in twenty-five volumes, nine for the ancient part, and sixteen for the modern.

Observations on the Epidemical Diseases now prevailing in London; with their method of treatment, prevention, &c. By Robert Hooper, M. D. 8vo.

The Asiatic Annual Register for the Year 1802.

Sharpe's Edition of the British Classics, Vol. I. (being a Volume of the Spectator.) 8vo.

The Progress of Maritime Discovery, from the earliest period to the close of the 18th century. By James Stanier Clarke, F. R. S. Vol. I. 4to. illustrated with charts.

Hints on the Policy of making a National Provision for the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland, as a mean to ameliorate the state of the Peasantry.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

GREAT BRITAIN.

A REPORT has lately been published by the Society for the Suppression of Vice, of which it was our intention to have given an abstract; but on examining it we found it to contain so many important discussions of subjects, which have acquired, at the present crisis, a very peculiar claim on the public attention, that we were induced to change our purpose, and to give a review rather than a mere abstract of it. This we shall endeavour to do in our next number.

On the 6th instant, Sir William Scott obtained leave to bring in a bill "for amending, and rendering more effectual, the laws relating to spiritual persons holding of farms, and for enforcing the residence of spiritual persons on their benefices."

The bill was read a first time on the seventh, and ordered to be read a second time on the 21st inst. In a preceding part of this number, the reader will find some remarks on the principle of Sir William Scott's former bill. We pretend not to say how far these will apply to the present measure. But as Sir William Scott, in his printed speech, has avowed the principle of subjecting the clergy in a variety of cases to the discretion of their bishops, instead of leaving them amenable, as at present, to plain rules of established law, we trust we shall be excused if, in this place, we make an additional observation or two on that principle.

For the last two hundred years, it has been the wise policy of this country to give the clergy the same interests with the community at large, and to afford the community solid grounds for confiding in their integrity and independence. To this end the clergy have been placed, not so much under the bishops as under the civil magistrate. Various evils, fatal to the character and influence of the clergy, with which a contrary system was attended during the prevalence of popery, have thus been avoided. Our ecclesiastics have not been led to take the tone of their religion from any human authority, however elevated in rank and station, but from the revealed will of God: and in politics, as they have been strenuous, so have they been unsuspected supporters of the British constitution. The identity of their interests and their independence were pledges of the sincerity and uprightness of the opinions they expressed, and of the advice they gave. Their influence has accordingly been great, and has contributed much towards enabling us, under God, to weather the storm which has desolated so many kingdoms on the continent.

We may expect, however, that love for the British constitution will be weakened, in proportion as men are deprived of its benefits; that the clergy will think and act with less independence, in proportion as they are made dependent on their superiors; and that their influence with the public will be lessened, in proportion as they become more liable to a suspicion of speaking

the sentiments of their ecclesiastical superiors rather than their own. In short, in proportion as we return to the papal system, we must expect to experience the evils which we have seen that system produce; and these evils, though on the first introduction of the new system, they might not be great and apparent, because the characters of men and public opinions are not changed at once; yet would be progressive, and, we think, certain.

Not only reasons of general policy, but tenderness for the clergy, should prevent the adoption of the system in question. Why should they be deprived of any of the benefits of the British constitution, and instead of living under known rules of law, be subjected, at least without a very evident and urgent necessity, to the discretion of an individual?

It is also to be feared, that, if the principles avowed by Sir William Scott in his printed speech were adopted, the clergy would be under a great temptation, in forming their religious opinions, to look rather to their superiors in the Church than to their Bibles, and to turn their eyes from the truth, or, at least, to abstain from preaching it, should it happen, at any time, not to be patronized by their spiritual rulers.

Our readers will perceive, that we have drawn their attention, at present, rather to the general system, which the principles advanced in Sir William Scott's printed speech would introduce, than to the question of clerical residence. Suffice it to say, on the latter point, that though some of the provisions of the act of Henry the Eighth are bad, the principle of the act is good, and might, we doubt not, easily be carried into effect by amending its provisions.

A letter addressed to the Bishop of St. Asaph, on the subject of NON-RESIDENCE, sold by Hatchard, appears to us to contain much good sense and sound argument, and we recommend its perusal to all who feel an interest in the important question of which it treats. The author, who is a magistrate, thinks that all which has been advanced in favour of the proposed repeal of the statute of Henry VIII., amounts to no more than an apology for particular instances of non-residence, and that the general necessity is unfairly deduced from a particular hardship. The parties also who are most interested in the controversy, viz. the parishioners, have been wholly overlooked, he observes, by Sir W. S.; but the legislature ought to consider, "that the eternal welfare of more human souls may be put in jeopardy by the non-residence of one clergyman, than the whole number of the clergy, to whom the statute of Henry VIII. can be a grievance." He then justly argues, that the present moment is ill suited to a measure calculated to relax, rather than to strengthen religious duties. The alarming increase of irreligion ought to have led to a measure of a directly opposite tendency. The author deprecates the proposal of taking the power of regulating this point out of the hands of a jury and the courts of common law, and placing it in the hands of individuals, because it strikes at the vitals of our constitution, and tends to produce relaxation in the Church, and irreligion among the people.

The proposal to repeal that part of the act of Henry VIII, which forbids the clergy to farm beyond a certain extent, is also considered by this able writer, and he shews, in a most convincing manner, its inexpediency. He justly observes, that a dealer in victuals never can be popular and respectable; and also that the moment the clergyman becomes a farmer, the poor will look upon him as one of their oppressors; for instead of standing between the poor and the farmer as now, he will be equally interested with the farmer, in lessening the amount of parochial relief. No reason, he argues, can exist for giving the clergy a public license to deal in corn and cattle, and thus subjecting them to the bankrupt laws, which would not be equally valid for a permission to deal in cloth, groceries, or coals; and he affirms, that it is not the most orthodox part of the clergy who look for this boon from

parliament, but a few dissatisfied and restless spirits. But if the clergy fall from their present high rank to mingle with farmers, maltsters, and carcase butchers, they will lose their respectability and their usefulness, and the favour intended them will, by degrees, destroy them and their establishment. "The people will be as much inclined to hear one farmer preach in a barn, as another in a Church." Besides, he adds, no petitions have been presented, no grievances have been stated, to warrant this extraordinary measure, so degrading to the clerical character. The statute, as it now stands, grants what is right, and prohibits what is wrong, and a very strong case, indeed, ought to be made out, before parliament consents to try this new and dangerous experiment.

Our object in bringing forward the present discussion, is merely to lead the friends of our Church and its ministers, and of the British constitution, to turn their thoughts with candour, but with earnestness, to the consideration of this important subject: it is a question deserving their serious attention; for the very existence of our Church may depend, in some measure, on adhering to our present principles of ecclesiastical government.

GERMANY.

The German Catholics, who by the late exchanges of territory have passed under the dominion of Protestant princes, are estimated at a million in number; the Protestants who have, at the same time, become subjects to the Catholic princes, are 156,450.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE question of peace or war still continues *(April 22)* to agitate the public mind. The state of the pending negotiations between this country and France is involved in such obscurity, that it would be hazardous to form a conjecture as to their probable issue. The measures pursued by the First Consul have worn so much the appearance of an attempt to intimidate, as to produce, in many, a presumption, that he does not find himself in a situation of sufficiently forward preparation for an actual rupture with England. The expedition fitting out in the Batavian ports, avowedly for Louisiana, is said, indeed, to have been discontinued; but Bonaparte has, at the same time, considerably augmented the number of his troops in Holland; and by a decree, the reasons of which do not appear, he has declared the town of Flushing to be in a state of siege. The Dutch garrisons which occupied that place, as well as Goree, the Brill, and Helvoetsluys, have been withdrawn, and French troops substituted in their stead. The expectation of renewed hostilities is said to have had a very injurious effect on the trade of Holland.

The most remarkable circumstance which we have had occasion to notice during the last month, has been the state of irritation into which the mind of the First Consul appears to have been thrown, by the timely anticipation of his ambitious projects. Not satisfied with the indecorous expression of his feelings to Lord Whitworth, of which we gave an account in our last number, he has had recourse to a very extraordinary expedient, in order to prepossess the different nations of Europe with an impression of the justice and propriety of his conduct on the present occasion. By means of menace and intimidation, applied through the medium of his minister, he obliged the senate of Hamburgh to admit into their official journal a kind of manifesto, in which the King's Message is canvassed with considerable severity of language, and in which it is attempted to give a turn to the above-mentioned conversation with Lord Whitworth, less discreditable to the magnanimity and self-government of Bonaparte.

FRANCE.

The threatened rupture between France and Algiers has been prevented by the appearance of a French squadron before that place. The Dey has consented to desist from the demand he had made of a tribute from Bonaparte.

Cardinal Doria, the Pope's Ablegate, charged with presenting the fiat to the French Bishops raised to the dignity of Cardinals, had lately an audience of the First Consul, by whom he was received with peculiar marks of distinction. Mass was afterwards celebrated; and during the ceremony, the Red Hats were placed by the hands of the First Consul on the heads of all the Cardinals. A speech was afterwards addressed to him by the Archbishop of Paris. "The clergy," says the prelate, "will never forget that it is to your *piety and goodness* that they are indebted for their actual existence. They will always consider it both their duty and their happiness, to teach the people, by their words and their example, the respect and submission that are due to you. They will not cease to invoke the benedictions of heaven on the *Christian* hero, their benefactor, and the assertor of their liberties; on the hero, at once the conqueror and pacificator of Europe; on the hero, who unites in himself all kinds

of glory to which the greatest men are allowed to aspire."

MALTA.

A Grand Master of the Order of St John of Jerusalem, has at length, been nominated. M. Thomasi is said to be wholly under French influence. Immediately on his appointment he despatched his lieutenant, who, contrary to the express letter of the Treaty of Amiens, is said to be a Frenchman by birth, to demand the delivery of the island. But this demand was refused by Sir Alexander Ball, on the ground that he had received no instructions to that effect, and that Russia and Austria had not accepted the office of guarantees of the independence of Malta, which had been assigned them by the Treaty of Amiens.

ISLAND OF GOREE.

On the 25th of January, this island was still in the possession of the British. Colonel Frazer refused to surrender it to the French, on the ground that no British transport had arrived to bring away the garrison, and that it was unprecedented in time of peace for a garrison to depart except in vessels of their own nation.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

This colony was delivered up to the Dutch in the month of February last.

AMERICA.

It appears, that on the 16th of December last the Intendant General of the Spanish Provinces issued a proclamation, forbidding all Spanish subjects to have any future commercial intercourse with subjects of the United States navigating the Mississippi, even for provisions, or any of the articles the most necessary to subsistence in a voyage. The same proclamation declares, that the subjects of the United States had no right, by treaty, to any trading navigation of the Mississippi, but for the export of their produce, and the import of articles indispensably necessary to their subsistence.

This proclamation had greatly enhanced the resentment of the Anglo-Americans against the Spaniards. The inhabitants of the Mississippi territory, in an address of their Assembly to the Congress, declared, that they were ready to devote their lives and fortunes, under its authority, to support their right to the free navigation of the Mississippi river, and to all the conveniences for that navigation, as stipulated by treaty with Spain.

It had been moved in Congress, that the president should be authorized to organize and arm 80,000 effective militia; but the result of the debate on that motion has not reached this country.

ST. DOMINGO.

The last official accounts of the state of the war in St. Domingo are dated the 9th of February. They speak of a severe defeat which the negroes had experienced; but from some incidental expressions it may be gathered, that the insurgents still infested the plain of the Cape, and that till the arrival of troops from France the General had been unable to *resume* offensive operations. The French arms have evidently made no progress in the subjugation of the interior of the island. Indeed in their despatches they only claim to possess the line of coast, with the exception of a few posts, which, they say, are well watched by ships of war.

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE PARLIAMENT adjourned on the 7th instant, and met again on the 19th. Previous to its adjournment, *Sir William Scott* obtained leave, as has been already stated, to bring in a bill for the regulation of *clerical residence*. This bill Sir William Scott thought it his duty to declare explicity, was fundamentally the same as that offered before to that House. The leading features and provisions were the same, though some of them were, no doubt, in many respects, somewhat softened in the expressions, and in the enactments also respecting such parts as appeared to trench on private convenience. He observed, that there were several cases which he had not included in the bill, but left to the future wisdom of Parliament, that of certain persons who had claimed exemptions from the bill, the amelioration of the state of the parochial clergy, relief to stipendiary curates, and the improvement of the small benefices. All these subjects deserved peculiar attention, but neither his single efforts nor information could enable him at present properly to provide for them. He observed in the case of the parochial clergy in particular, that if the clergy were enabled to repair their mansions properly, it would in a great measure remove the complaint of non-residence. He had not extended the provisions of the present bill to Ireland, as he was not sufficiently informed with regard to the state of the clergy in that kingdom, but if the representatives of that kingdom wished for a similar measure, it might easily be obtained. He expressed a hope, that a measure on which he had bestowed so much consideration, would be fairly and candidly discussed.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer*, by his Majesty's command, presented at the bar of the House the report of a survey of the roads in the highlands of Scotland, made in 1801 and 1802, being preparatory to the execution of a plan of great public utility; which was, the forming of a direct communication between Fort William and Inverness, and thereby facilitating the intercourse between the eastern districts of that part of Great Britain and the coasts.

On the 13th instant, a ballot was taken for the election of six Directors of the East India Company. At the close of the ballot, the numbers stood as follows:

R. Chichly Plowden, Esq.	1528
Charles Mills, Esq.	1404
Abraham Robarts, Esq.	1367
Simon Fraser, Esq.	1187
Thomas Parry, Esq.	1006
John Hudleston, Esq.	997
John Inglis, Esq.	815
George Tatem, Esq.	776
Thomas Read, Esq.	675
John Bebb, Esq.	506

Whereupon the first six were declared duly elected.

The King has been pleased to grant to the Reverend Matthew Surtees, Clerk, M. A. the place and dignity of a Canon or Prebendary of Canterbury, void by the death of the Rev. J. Barton.

The King has also been pleased to present the Reverend Caleb Rockett, Clerk, B. A. to the Vicarage of Stockingham, in the county of Devon.

His Majesty has been pleased to direct, that in consequence of the deficiency in zeal, energy, and activity, in certain officers of the 83d regiment, quartered at Chelmsford, in not endeavouring to curb the licentiousness of the soldiers, they shall be immediately placed on half-pay. In consequence, Lieutenant-Colonel Skerrot, and Captains Armstrong and Grant, are ordered to quit the quarters of the 83d regiment immediately. We trust that this well-timed exercise of royal severity will produce its proper effect, in exciting a more wakeful attention in military men to the moral state of the soldiery under their command.

During the course of the last month, the price of the FUNDS has undergone great fluctuations; and the failures on the Stock Exchange have, in consequence, been numerous and extensive. Three per cent. consols were at one time so low as 61 3-4, they afterwards rose to 67½, and on the 22nd instant they fell again to 63. These great and rapid changes, and the failures occasioned by them, may, no doubt, be ascribed in part to the very uncertain state of public affairs. But they are chiefly to be traced, as we apprehend, to the spirit of gambling; a spirit, which we are sorry to say, is not confined to those only who do not profess to be guided by Christian principles, but which has infected even the more religious part of the community. Not a few are to be found, who while perfectly orthodox in their creed, apparently zealous for the diffusion of religious knowledge, and avowedly hostile to the frivolous amusements of the world, scruple not to participate largely in the gambling speculations of the stock exchange, and to increase, by the influence of their example, the pernicious effects which lotteries are known to produce on the moral and religious habits of the poor. We readily admit, that there may be some persons who, from not having duly investigated the subject, are not fully acquainted with its real merits: but then they are bound to institute the inquiry; and in that case, we are persuaded, all who are not blinded by the love of gain, will discover it to be their duty to avoid these practices. With what consistency can those who are severe, (and we think justly so,) in condemning the use of cards and dice, plead for the lawfulness of gambling in the funds or adventuring in the lottery? The mischievous effects of the former are acknowledged, and we should be sorry to be thought for a moment to extenuate them; but we have little hesitation in saying, that their amount does not seem to us to equal the aggregate of the evil produced by the latter. We mean not, however, to confine our censure of the practices in question to a consideration of general consequences. We think them still more censurable, on account of the motives to which they *necessarily* owe their origin: they have not even the plea of amusement to urge in their defence; they are the genuine offspring of that covetousness and love of the world, which are declared to be idolatry; and they never fail to give birth to numerous cares and anxieties which tend "to choke the good seed," and render it unfruitful, in cases where, at one time, it promised an abundant harvest.

The peculiar temptations to which those are exposed, who, not content to tread the plain path of honest labour, resort to means of so questionable a nature as those on which we have been animadverting in order to acquire wealth, have been recently exemplified, in a very striking manner, by the following occurrence, an account of which we extract for the information of our readers. "On the 9th instant Mr. ASLETT, Assistant Cashier at the Bank, brought a quantity of Exchequer Bills to Mr. Bish, a Stock-broker, for sale, who, upon examining them, found among them the very Bills which he had a short time before sold to the Bank. Conceiving that there might be some mistake, he went to the Bank, and communicated the circumstance to one of the Directors. An investigation was immediately instituted, the result of which discovered, that Mr. Aslett had been of late in the practice of re-issuing, for his own private benefit, Exchequer Bills, which, having been bought in by the Bank, had been deposited under his custody. He was in consequence apprehended, and has undergone several long and minute examinations, by which it appears, that his embezzlements have amounted to the enormous sum of *four hundred thousand pounds*. Mr. Aslett, it has been said, was a man of modest, unexpensive habits, had been brought up from a youth under the immediate care and favour of Mr. Abraham Newland, and had not, apparently, been in the habit of expending more than £500. though his situation was worth nearly £3000. per annum. He was known, however, for some time, as a speculator in 'Change-alley, and it is believed that his losses, on the late fall of the funds, led to the disastrous predicament in which he is involved. He was highly respected, and his credit was very great among the monied men in the city.

Nor is the case of Mr. Aslett singular. We have had access to know one or two melancholy instances of scarcely inferior guilt which

have lately occurred, but which from their peculiar nature cannot be made the subjects of public crimination. But what is the lesson which these things ought to impress upon our minds? It is this, "They that *will* be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition; for the love of money is the root of all evil; which, while some covet after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, *flee these things.*" 1 Tim. vi. 9—11.

DUELLING.

The practice of duelling is so manifestly at variance with the spirit and precepts of Christianity, that it would be wasting the time of our readers to attempt a formal proof of its criminality. There are many, however, who do not hesitate to acknowledge its total inconsistency with scripture, who yet concede to the advocates for its use, that there exists, in certain cases, a kind of necessity which extinguishes, or at least greatly palliates, its guilt. But such a concession is both dangerous and unwarranted. No necessity can ever exist for sinning against God, particularly when the sin, as in the case of duelling, is deliberately committed. Besides, may we not ask, Are not pride, hatred, revenge, and a contempt of the authority of God, some of the passions which must actuate the mind of the duellist, not only when *an affair of honour*, as it is called, leads him to seek the life of a fellow-creature, but at all times? for he who lives in the determination of fighting a duel, whenever he may chance to receive an affront, may, without doubt, be considered as habitually influenced by these affections, and therefore, as always chargeable in the sight of God with the guilt of premeditated murder. We mean not, however, to pursue this subject farther than to obviate any suspicion which silence might occasion of our not having formed a clear opinion upon it. Our attention has been called to it by some recent occurrences, to one only of which we shall now advert.

On the 6th instant, a duel took place between Colonel Montgomery and Captain Macnamara. Their quarrel was produced by a very trivial occurrence. Their dogs happened to fight: high words ensued, and a challenge was the consequence. The parties met the same evening, attended by their seconds, and Mr. Heaviside the surgeon; and all mediation proving vain, they took their distance at twelve paces, and fired together. The ball from Captain Macnamara's pistol entered the right side of Colonel Montgomery, who immediately exclaimed, "I am shot through the heart," and fell: in about twenty minutes he expired. Colonel Montgomery's ball took place just above the hip of Captain Macnamara, and passed through the left side. Can it be believed, that there was not a deliberate purpose on the part of both these gentlemen to aim at the life of his antagonist? Such a purpose, on grounds so slight and trivial, appears to us to present not one circumstance of palliation half so strong as may be produced in the case of almost every murder which is tried at the Old Bailey.

The coroner's inquest, held on the body of Colonel Montgomery, brought in a verdict of manslaughter against his antagonist; but even of this mitigated charge, the jury, which tried Captain Macnamara, have acquitted him, although the fact of his *killing* the deceased, was proved even by his own confession.

It seems a most extraordinary circumstance, that among a people who rank so high in the scale of civilization, and of whose comparative regard to the duties of religion and the claims of humanity we are accustomed so much to boast; although the determination of these gentlemen to fight was known to a considerable number of persons, who bear a respectable character in society, for two or three hours before it was executed; not one was found who so far valued the laws either of God, or of his country, or the life of a fellow-creature, as to engage the police in preventing the fatal meeting. We shall probably take an early opportunity of recurring to this subject; but we cannot quit it without expressing our hope, that the attention of the legislature will be applied to devise the best means of preventing a repetition of such scenes as that detailed above; scenes as savage in their nature and as disgraceful to civilized society, as they are afflictive to humanity and repugnant to every principle of the Gospel. Those who possess the power of remedying these enormities, would do well to reflect on the awful responsibility which they incur by their supineness in exercising it.

OBITUARY.

ADVANTAGES OF EARLY PIETY.

We none of us know how to value as we ought the advantages of having religious parents; and how to form a due estimate of the sin, and consequent misery, of not improving that blessing.

I have been led to reflect on these subjects, by the case of a young man just called into the presence of his God, who was sent by his friends into my neighbourhood for his health, and recommended to my notice.

When I first saw him, he was evidently very ill; and I was glad, that by mentioning religion almost as soon as we met, he afforded me an opportunity of making some inquiries, and some observations, which the occasion suggested. He ingenuously owned, that he had turned a deaf ear to the pious suggestions and advice of his good mother, until the fear of death, about three months before, had appalled him, and made him fly for refuge to

religion. Previously to this event, though he had defended Christian truths in opposition to Sceptics, and for some time complied with the solemn request of his father, that he would attend a particular place of worship, his heart seems to have been entirely unaffected. I found that he had for a month or two been in the habit of reading Scripture; and particularly the book of Psalms, which he relished as always affording him matter suited to his case in his different frames of mind. He spoke with much approbation of a book, which a relation had, without his knowledge, put into his travelling trunk. I was pleased to find that this was an excellent and practical treatise on the nature and effects of vital religion. In addition to these very favourable circumstances, I thought I saw in him a frank and teachable spirit, and a disposition to prayer. After making such remarks as I thought might be of use to him, pointing out some parts of Scripture to his attention, and lending him a religious book, I took my leave; entertaining very strong hopes, that, extremely scanty as his religious knowledge evidently was, he was under the divine teaching, and in the way of salvation.

My distance from him, and particular circumstances, prevented my renewing my visit until about a week had elapsed. On entering his chamber, I thought that his illness had evidently increased. This circumstance induced me to recur very speedily to a religious subject. However, I was much less pleased with his conversation than I had been before. He spoke with reserve, and seemed rather to wish to converse on other topics, and uttered a sentiment apparently inconsistent with something which he had said, when I had been last with him. After speaking to him, as plainly as I could without giving offence, on two or three points of prime importance, I left him, hoping that some circumstance of a temporary nature had unhinged his mind, and indisposed him at that time for religious conversation. Being informed however by one of the family with whom he resided, that his physician thought him in a state of great danger, and that he had used profane language in his intercourse with the servants, I determined to return to him, especially as the members of the family, and his physician, shrunk from the task of imparting to him the awful information, that he was probably on the very brink of eternity.—information, which, doubtful as the state of his soul appeared to be, it was peculiarly important that he should receive. Though I executed the task I had undertaken with as much tenderness and delicacy as I could, he was greatly shocked. I sat some time with him, and endeavoured to lead his mind from temporal to eternal things, mixing the bright hopes, which Christianity holds out to the true followers of the Saviour, with those energetic and solemn calls to genuine repentance and absolute faithfulness, which what had been said to me respecting his profane language could not but suggest. Poor man! he struggled hard to persuade himself and me, that he could not be in danger, and clung to this world, with an anxiety which confined our conversation, in a far greater degree than I wished, to a discussion respecting his state of health. As I felt myself bound to express my dissent from his opinions, this line of conversation was, on my own account, as well as his, extremely irksome to me. I took leave of him with cordial good wishes, accompanied with a strong exhortation not to labour "for the meat which perisheth," and to profit by the warning, which the providence of God had given him through me.

In a few days I renewed my visit, and found him still, poor young man! struggling for a prolongation of life: a struggle in which all he could do must be utterly unavailing; and grievously impeded thereby in his spiritual course. He caught at straws, and though evidently on his death-bed, succeeded in some measure in persuading himself, that the very circumstances which proved the aggravation of his disease were favourable symptoms. His mind however was calm; and though his state of health appeared to be the subject on which it was most employed, yet he listened to religious conversation much more readily than before, and from the part he took in it, I hoped that he had been no stranger to prayer and spiritual meditation since I had last seen him. But still all that was pleasing and promising on these and other religious points, fell much below what I wished to have found in him. I again spoke to him very earnestly, though with tenderness and affection, of the things which belonged to his peace, and endeavoured to shew him the great futility of speculations about the state of his health.

Very bad weather, and domestic circumstances, kept me from him for nearly a week. At last, when I was on the point of setting out to see him, I heard that he had expired the preceding evening. On making inquiries respecting his state of mind before his death, I had the satisfaction of finding, that he had met death with composure and fortitude, and with a prayer book in his hand. A lady of the family thought him a true penitent.

Earnestly do I hope, that this lady's opinion may have been well founded. But is it possible to witness a case like that of this young gentleman, without the deepest regret, that the calls of the lord of the vineyard were so long heard in vain; and, if obeyed at all, were not obeyed until the eleventh hour, when the bewildered labourer has often scarcely time to seize his tools, and begin to use them, before his day is gone? What must be the effect of his example among his fellows? What the feelings with which he must approach his Lord? He has spent many hours in the open dishonour, and only one in a very unskilful and indifferent, if not also a very dubious service, of the gracious master whom he was always bound to love and obey.

But suppose him not *really* to have engaged as a labourer with his Lord; suppose him to have taken his tools in hand indeed, but not to have determined in good earnest to use them; suppose him to have been still so far under the influence of the motives, which induced him to refuse to become his Lord's servant during so great a part of the day, as even at last rather to make some shew of working than to set to his spiritual work with full purpose of heart: what has he not lost by the egregious folly, and flagrant guilt of his procrastinaton? what must he not endure as his merited punishment? Let young people think of this, and beware of trifling with offers of mercy while in health and vigour.

But much as the kind of case, which I have been describing, leaves surviving friends to regret and to apprehend; it also gives parents the greatest encouragement to labour with all diligence, in humble dependence on the divine blessing, to sow the good seed in the hearts of their offspring. No doubt the blessing, which God promises to the descendants of them who love him for thousands of generations, is, in no small measure, conveyed by means of the instruction which he puts it into the hearts of parents to give their children; and the amount of the blessing will bear some, and perhaps a great proportion to the diligence and care with which the appointed means are used by parents. How different in all human probability would have been the end of this young man, had he been the son of irreligious or worldly parents! Instead of being pricked to the heart, and in a measure sensible where help was to be sought, when death seemed to threaten him, he would very likely have run the course of that multitude of thoughtless and wretched youths, who drop into untimely graves every year, and are either stupidly indifferent to their spiritual state, or, if they seek any refuge from the wrath to come, fly to a refuge of lies. Having had an example of holiness before him in childhood and early youth, this young man was the better able to detect sin in himself, when his eyes were opened to see his danger. Christian truths were not new to him. Christian duties had been recommended to him, both by the precepts and the practice of his parents. He therefore had recourse to prayer, to meditation, to the most devotional parts of Scripture, and, I hope, in humble faith to the Saviour.

His state of mind at least did not exhibit that dismal and terrible blank, as to spiritual views and dispositions, which so frequently freezes and appals those, who are called to sick beds, and look out anxiously for better things; on the contrary, it afforded considerable grounds of hope respecting him. And if I, who was so newly introduced to his acquaintance, felt much comfort in this thought, what consolation must his pious parents receive from the account that will probably be given them of his death? Oh, Mr. Editor, let us attend to "the one thing needful," in our care of our children, with the earnestness and unremitting care which its transcendant importance demands. And though in this, as in every case, it is God alone who can give the increase; yet what ground have we to expect any increase, unless we make it our daily, and almost our hourly, business to till, and plant, and water, while our children continue near us; and do all, which circumstances will admit, in the same way, after they have left our sides. B. T.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I SEND you a few particulars respecting a member of my congregation, which you are at liberty to insert in your useful miscellany.

CLERICUS.

ON Friday, the first of April, 1803, in the 36th year of her age, Mrs. Newbald, the wife of Mr. Newbald, merchant, of Hull. Mrs. Newbald was trained up in the school of adversity. At an age when persons expect a long continuance of domestic happiness, she was cut off from all the pleasures of life, and doomed to pine away under the languors of a secret but fatal disease. She had, however, sought God in the days of ease and health, and he did not desert her in the time of sickness and death. She well knew the way of life and salvation through Christ, and had built her hopes of happiness entirely upon him; and her religion, which was neither noisy nor ostentatious, always displayed itself in a careful regard to every relative duty.

Though her sickness commenced in the early part of her life, and continued for many years to make a fatal progress on her weak frame, yet, I believe, she was never heard to make but one complaint; that complaint, however, I have heard her frequently repeat; it was, that she was so long debarred from enjoying the privileges of public worship.

Instead of troubling her friends with the detail of her sufferings, she had always something to relate of the goodness of God to her; and she was used to declare, that in the times of the severest outward affliction, she experienced the greatest inward comfort.

She had often apparently been brought to the borders of the grave, but when the solemn season of her departure actually approached, she soon became too weak to express either hopes or fears. Whilst she had strength, she spoke with the greatest calmness of her death, gave orders respecting her funeral, and requested, that her children might be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. For a short time she seemed to experience some anxiety, but it was soon dispersed. Her last words respected the love of Christ, and she breathed out her soul without a struggle or sigh, in full and certain hope of a blessed resurrection.

On the 15th instant, died at Clapham, Mrs. Venn, wife of the Rev. John Venn, Rector of

that parish. The irreparable loss which an affectionate husband, and a family of seven young children, as well as a large circle of relatives and friends, have sustained by this mournful event, can be estimated only by those who were acquainted with the character of this most exemplary Christian. Of her superior excellence and worth, the unfeigned dejection and concern which her death occasioned throughout the parish, afforded an unequivocal testimony: no one, indeed, who knew her, did not, at the same time, both love and esteem her; and, what is no mean or ordinary praise, she was valued in proportion as she was known.

She had learned of him who was meek and lowly in heart, and was, therefore, eminently distinguished by that invaluable, yet unenvied, species of female excellence, which St. Peter describes as standing peculiarly high in the divine estimation. Her piety was fervent, yet unobtrusive; her humility, deep and unaffected. Genuine simplicity of manners; unreserved devotedness to the service of God; a firm, yet unassuming, superiority to worldly vanities, and a wakeful and disinterested solicitude for the temporal and eternal interests of her fellow-creatures, marked and adorned her character. The great sweetness of her disposition, the tenderness of her attachments, and the unwearied assiduity of her attentions, served to bind, with more than ordinary strength, the cords of affection which connected her as a wife, a mother, a daughter, a sister, and a friend. But her charities were by no means confined to the domestic or social circle. She was, more especially, the friend and patroness of the destitute and afflicted in her parish; for whom she felt an almost parental sympathy, and towards whom she exercised a parental care. Such, indeed, had been the previous tenor of her life, such also her habits of intercourse with God, and of dependance on the Saviour of sinners, that when the summons of death reached her, she may be said to have had nothing to do but to die.

Her illness was only of eight days continuance: during that time, in the midst of severe bodily suffering, and in the view of parting with all that was dear to her in this world, she uniformly maintained a tranquil, resigned, and even thankful frame of mind. Not a murmur escaped her lips; and if she opened them, it was chiefly to notice, with gratitude, the goodness of God, or to express her unshaken trust and confidence in the power and grace of his Son. Her calm and cheerful acquiescence in the will of the Almighty; her lively, but humble, hope in his mercy through Jesus Christ; and the tender solicitude for the present comfort and eternal welfare of those whom she was about to leave, which marked her last hours, were highly edifying to all who witnessed the melancholy scene, while they furnished a satisfactory assurance that she was about to exchange pain, and weakness, and mortality, for the glories of the heavenly world. What an unspeakable source of consolation must it prove to those, who have been deprived of her society on earth, to reflect, that she has now, as we trust, joined the society of saints and angels in heaven, and is unspeakably blessed in the presence and perfect fruition of her God and Saviour.

The writer cannot conclude this imperfect and unvarnished sketch, without apologizing to the relations of his deceased friend for its communication, to which he has been prompted by a desire, that so eminent an instance of the power of divine grace should not pass unnoticed and unimproved. Though not connected with her by the ties of blood, he knew and prized her worth, he has mingled his tears with theirs on her unexpected departure from the world, and he rejoices with them in the assured hope of her present and endless felicity. May all who read this account of her character, be disposed to say from the heart—"Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like *hers*." Q. F.

DEATHS.

Died, greatly lamented, on Good Friday, after a painful illness of about two months, which she was enabled to bear with much christian patience and resignation, expressing great confidence in the merits of her Redeemer, and a modest assurance of salvation through his merits, Catherine, the youngest daughter of Mr. John Russell, Bookseller, Guildford, Surry.

At Long Clanton, Leicestershire, the Rev. Mr. Chamberlain was conversing with some of his intimate friends, who called on him in their way to Church, when he observed the time was expired, and immediately rose from his chair, dropped down, and never rose more. It is somewhat remarkable, that Mr. Chamberlain, the preceding Sunday, preached from these words—"Brethren, the time is short." In his discourse, he particularly noticed the many sudden deaths that had occurred, and earnestly exhorted his hearers to be ready for the solemn event.

At Venice, on the 27th of January, the Countess of Minelli met with a most dreadful accident. In the afternoon, being at the house of her daughter, the Countess of Sandi, and the weather very cold, she stood with her back to the fire, which communicated to one side of her dress. The persons in the apartment, alarmed at the progress of the flames, instead of assisting her, ran out to call in the aid of the domestics; during which interval, the unfortunate sufferer was so scorched, that in the evening she expired in the greatest tortures, in the 54th year of her age.

March 14. At Hamburgh, the celebrated Poet Klopstock, in his 79th year.

Same day, at Huntingdon, after a very short illness, the Reverend James Mackintosh, Rector of Papworth Agnes, in Cambridgeshire.

Last week, aged 97, at Hampton-Wick, Middlesex, Peter de la Rive, Esq. many years a respectable merchant in London.

March 14. In George-street, Hanover-square, aged 73, Mrs. Lowth, relict of the late Bishop of London.

March 21. At his seat at Twinsted-hall, near, Sudbury, as he was sitting in his chair, aged 72, Sir James Marriott, many years Member for Sudbury, late Judge of the Admiralty Court, and Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Same day, at Chiswick, the Hon. Thomas Walpole, in his 76th year.

Reverend Mr. Eyre, Minister of Homerton Chapel

At Bristol, the very Rev. Dr. Layard, Dean of that Cathedral. From the time of his appointment to that situation, he had been very assiduous in the discharge of his official duties, particularly in instructing the boys belonging to the choir, to whom, together with as many more as chose to attend, he was in the habit of expounding the church catechism twice a week. He had also, by his influence, effected the establishment in Bristol of a Society for the Suppression of Vice, similar to that instituted in London. He has left a large family, we are sorry to add, in destitute circumstances.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS, &c. &c.

THE following Letter ought to have been inserted in an earlier part of this Number. Our readers however will, we trust, excuse the irregularity which has thrown it out of its proper place.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

WHEN I considered the original professions of the gentlemen concerned in the publication of the *Anti-jacobin Review*, I naturally expected that, in the execution of their important undertaking, they would prove to be men of the first respectability for Christian piety and candour of mind, as well as for solidity of judgment and extensive erudition. I was hence induced to cherish the flattering hope, that our established Church would derive so substantial a support from their periodical lucubrations, as would kindle a modest blush in the cheek of sectarianism; and that, while they wielded in her defence the sword of the spirit, they would, by an unvaried uniformity of sentiment, and a prominent meekness of temper, do honour to the cause of truth, and disarm the rage of opposition.

But when I pay a calm attention to that part of their progressive labours, which relates to our ecclesiastical and ministerial concerns, (passing over every topic of a different hue;) when I reflect on the partial encomiums, with which they decorate the compositions of some of their correspondents, and the load of obloquy which they cast on the names of such writers, as honestly adhere to the literal meaning of the 39 articles; when I, moreover, revolve in my mind the glaring repugnancy that subsists between what they have boldly asserted at one time, and what, on a different occasion, has emanated from their pen; I am filled with surprise. It is not my intention to follow their example in the adoption of coarse contumelious expressions; nor in levelling charges of a defamatory nature against any members of their corps, drawn from the uncertain source of private information: for whenever a man, engaged in the act of crimination, or re-crimination, or even of self-vindication, deviates from the politeness of a gentleman, and, much more from the urbanity of a Christian, I leave it to the world to determine, what are the discriminating features of his character: but I will confine my attention to a few things out of many, which they and their friends have openly advanced; and thus calmly ground my complaint on irresistible evidence.

I had always supposed, that *orthodoxy* was a relative term, and implied an appeal to some acknowledged standard of religious truth. This standard, in a primary sense, is the Bible, or revealed word of God: but, in a secondary, which regards our manner of interpreting the scriptures in some essential points of doctrine, it is that system of theology which our Church maintains in her liturgy, articles, and homilies. I consider this representation of the case to be absolutely incontrovertible. If, therefore, these gentlemen would compare any tenets, occurring in the compositions that are the subjects of their review, with the aforesaid standard, and point out any instance of divergency from it, their mode of proceeding would be perfectly correct, and entitle them to commen-

dation. But when, instead hereof, they launch out into bitter invectives, and even suffer such strange expressions to escape from them, as import a dissatisfaction with the standard itself, what shall we think are, at bottom, the articles of their creed? or, how shall we, at any time, be able to ascertain their real sentiments?

They profess to be in divinity staunch Churchmen, and present themselves to the public as the guardians of orthodoxy. Heresy and schism are the avowed objects of their exterminating zeal; and (what is very singular) they give us a new description of schism, by branding with that odious appellation, every doctrine which they disapprove: whereas hitherto it had been considered as a causeless separation from the communion of the Catholic Church of Christ. What is their own systematic Shibboleth, they have not ventured in express terms to acknowledge, but have partly supplied that omission by the critique, which they occasionally pass on other writers.

Here let it be asked, what do they require from that clergyman, whom they denominate heterodox, and whom they charge with the introduction of schism into the Church, although he is by principle firmly attached to her communion? Is he, in complaisance to their judgment, to preach any doctrine of theirs, which he does not believe to be true? Is he to give a stab to his own conscience, by making declarations from the pulpit, which to him appear to be both unscriptural and inconsistent with that standard of truth, which he has pledged himself to maintain? Would such be *their* conduct, if they were in his situation? And would it be consistent with even heathen honesty? But how is he to know, that in his doctrine he is heterodox, or (as they term it) schismatical, any otherwise than by a reference to some standard? And to what standard shall we appeal? To the doctrine of the Church in her 39 articles? Will not such an appeal as that, be the object of their ridicule? For when the Rev. Dr. Hawker, of Plymouth, took this very method of vindicating himself from the charge of maintaining false doctrine, they politely treated him with a smile courteous, and expressed their admiration at his placing himself behind such a shield, by subjoining three solemn marks of significance!!!

What is to be done for this obnoxious and unfortunate clergyman, for the cure of his errors? We must recommend to him, I suppose, a diligent perusal of all the numbers of the Anti-jacobin Review, in order to derive from that source of instruction the principles of Christianity, though they are to be found only in scattered hints.

In the year 1799, the Rev. Mr. Polwhele addressed a printed letter to the Rev. Dr. Hawker, of Plymouth, in which he denied the doctrine of *original sin*, in that sense in which our Church holds it; for our Church says in her catechism (over and above what she maintains in her 9th article,) that we are "by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath." But in defiance of the catechism, and of the baptismal offices, as well as of the 9th article, Mr. Polwhele asserts, that the calvinistic doctrine of original sin is FALSE; and he there maintains other tenets of the like complexion. But we may challenge Mr. Polwhele and all his abetters to cite any passage on the subject, from Calvin's Institutes, or from any other part of his works, that is expressed in stronger terms than what we find in the 9th article, or in the following passage which occurs in the homily on the nativity of Christ. "As before, he (Adam) was most beautiful and precious; so now he was most vile and wretched in the sight of his Lord and Master. Instead of the image of God, he was now become the image of the devil; instead of the citizen of heaven, he was now become the bond-slave of hell; having in himself no one part of his former purity and cleanness, but being altogether spotted and defiled, insomuch that he now seemed to be nothing else but a lump of sin, and therefore by the just judgment of God was condemned to everlasting death. This, so great and miserable a plague, if it had only rested on Adam, who first offended, it had been so much the

easier, and might the better have been borne. But it fell not only on him, but also on his posterity; so that the whole brood of Adam's flesh should sustain the self-same fall and punishment, which their forefather, by his offence, most justly had sustained." Likewise, in the first part of the homily for Whit-Sunday, "Man, of his own nature, is fleshly, carnal, corrupt, naught, sinful, and disobedient to God; without any spark or goodness in him, without any virtuous or godly motion, only given to evil thoughts and wicked deeds."

Mr. Polwhele, however, is so far from having incurred the censure of these gentlemen for any assertion of his, that they always speak of his compositions with high commendation; and, of late, have honourably ranked him with "a Whitaker, a Boucher, a Gleig, and a Gilpin," saying of them jointly, in No. 55, that they are "ornaments of literature, and supports of piety." Such is their zeal for Church of England orthodoxy! In this same number they review a pamphlet, entituled, "Considerations on the present State of Religion, speculative and practical, in this Country." It is evident, that the author is very much disgusted with our 39 articles; for he represents them as giving countenance to Methodism; particularly objects to the thirteenth; calls them "a stumbling-block," expressing his wish that it may be removed; and he proposes it as the best method of "securing purity of doctrine, and uniformity of worship in our national Church, to require of the clergy only an unequivocal assent to the book of common prayer," after it has undergone "a few inconsiderable omissions and verbal corrections." He also entertains us with a specimen of low wit, by observing, that such clergymen as are distinguished by the name of Gospel-preachers, should rather be denominated "*Epistle*-preachers;" as if the Epistles were not founded on the same divine authority as the Gospels, or the Apostles were not miraculously raised up as inspired interpreters of the doctrines of Christ. Here it is natural to suspect, that the aforesaid author is a man of Arian and Socinian principles under disguise. However, it is obvious to ask, What say the Editors of the Anti-jacobin Review, the professed guardians of orthodoxy? Hear, and be astonished. "A great deal of useful matter is contained in this little pamphlet; and we are very much OBLIGED to the author for LIBERAL SENTIMENT, guided by religious sincerity." Thus they begin to throw off the mask. They are advocates for *liberal sentiment* on divine subjects; that is, they are free-thinkers; and this anonymous writer is their prolocutor. They see that the 39 articles give countenance to what they erroneously appropriate to methodism; and hence they wish for the removal of so great a stumbling-block. But even this will not give them entire satisfaction, for the book of common prayer must also undergo "a few inconsiderable omissions and verbal corrections." If, however what these gentlemen wish, should ever be carried into execution, instantly Socinianism, Arianism, and even barefaced Deism, will rush in upon us with a full tide. Yet in the accomplishment of their wish, they will experience a severe disappointment; because even the most rigid Calvinists, being extricated from the same trammels as all others, will be at liberty to propagate their sentiments without the possibility of controul, and without any shadow of pretence for censure. And even if those among us, whom they in jocular contempt style Epistle-preachers, could ever be persuaded to confine their theology to the contracted limits of the four Gospels, still they would have an authority for enforcing the tenets contained in such passages as these, uttered by the Divine Jesus, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me, draw him." John vi. 44.—"In that day shall the son of man send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Matt. xxiv. 31.

Let us now bestow a little attention on what has dropped from the pen of

Dr. Croft, another of their admired correspondents, in No. 56, on the seventeenth article. "I have been taught," he says, "for many years, to believe it an article of peace, designed to accommodate two contending parties." As such, it must have a fixed and determinate meaning, and the meaning must be that, to which each of the contending parties can subscribe with a safe conscience. In this case what room can there be for an outcry about Calvinism? For the article, according to the Doctor, is equally favourable to the Calvinist as to the Arminian. If then I maintain, that "predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation," not all mankind, but "THOSE whom he hath chosen in Christ OUT OF mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour;" that "they which be endued with so excellent a gift, be called according to God's purpose by his spirit working in due season," &c. &c. and that "the godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as *feel*," or experience, "in themselves the working of Christ," &c.; who now shall venture to affirm, that I am a Calvinist? For the article, says Dr. Croft, "is an article of peace;" and steers so nicely between two extremes, as to accommodate each of the contending parties.

It has not escaped my observation, that in their representation of the Rev. E. Cooper's visitation sermon, in No. 52, they have given him his due meed of praise, and have expressed a warm approbation of all its contents. But in such conduct, where is their self-consistency? For the whole structure of that discourse is built on those principles, which are maintained by our Church in her 39 articles, and which they are pleased in other parts of their work to style Calvinistic.

It was not till after I had written the foregoing, that I saw what they have offered in exculpation of their misconduct in No. 57. But what a mere evasion is their apology? How awkward, and insufficient! For, it seems, if one member of their body happen to be ill, the public, while reading their work, is to be exposed to any noxious principles, which an Arian or Socinian or Schismatic may send to their publisher. Would they have admitted the force of such an apology, had it been made by "the more than semi-methodistical Editor of the Christian Observer?" Their allegation itself amounts to an explicit confession that, notwithstanding all their former specious professions, they have admitted and retained in their fraternity a man, who is an enemy to the religion and polity of our ecclesiastical constitution. And let the world judge, whether it be not reasonable to say, *ex uno disce omnes*. In an unguarded moment, their plot is disclosed. Their phalanx (as they term it) is a Grecian phalanx, drawn up in battle array before the walls of Troy. Their principles and their aims are all assuredly the same: and what must be the final consequence? Whenever the boundaries of our Church shall be laid prostrate, and her land-marks removed; what will become of our national religion, and on what basis will the safety of the state be supported?

We may now, with peculiar propriety, recall to their remembrance two passages, that occur in the original prospectus of their work and their prefatory address, viz. "We are deeply prejudiced in favour of our country, and are highly partial to her constitution and laws, to HER RELIGION and government; these we shall defend to the utmost of our ability. If ever we shall be found to depart from those principles, on which this work was avowedly established, may we experience that neglect and disgrace, which must invariably attach to so flagrant a breach of duty."

That every unlettered reader may be duly acquainted with that refinement of manners, which stands foremost to view in the character of these

gentlemen, it will be sufficient to state, amidst a multiplicity of illustrations, that the English translation of the Latin words, *mentiris impudentissimé*, which they have lately been in the habit of freely using, is plainly this,

"YOU TELL A MOST IMPUDENT LIE."

"Want of decency is want of sense."

POPE.

The fiery spirit of intolerance, which pervades all their animadversions on the religious publications of such authors as are obnoxious to them, is totally indefensible in every point of view; being not only inconsistent with the mild genius of Christianity, but with the natural rights of conscience, and the common dictates of reason. Our Church is, indeed, an episcopal society, instituted by divine authority, and none of its members should ever withdraw themselves from her communion, so long as she retains, with unsullied purity, the original doctrine of Christ. But is it, therefore, a justifiable act indiscriminately to exclude from salvation all who imprudently separate, and with one stroke of the pen to unchristianize every individual Dissenter? Must we consign to eternal damnation a Doddridge, a Watts, or a Howard? Will we, in the paroxysms of our zeal, make no allowance for the prejudices of education, the insuperable ignorance of multitudes in the common walks of life, and a thousand other nameless considerations?

Let us rather exhibit in our whole conduct all the genuine features of the Christian character, and "in meekness instruct those who oppose themselves" Let us be studious to demonstrate, from our own example, that "the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance;" and then let us zealously unite both hand and heart in endeavouring, by every scriptural mode of exertion, to promote the interests of our venerable establishment, and to build up the walls of our Jerusalem. E.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We greatly regret that we have been under the absolute necessity of deferring the communications of A CURATE OF THE SOUTH; JOHN; J. M.; O.; &c. together with several reviews, which we were anxious to insert.

We beg to assure a Baptist Minister, who has favoured us with a long admonitory letter, that we meant no offence whatever to him, or any of his brethren, in allowing the word ANABAPTIST to stand unaltered in the paper of a correspondent. We take in good part all he has said, and shall not be hindered by the caustic severity of some of his remarks, from profiting by his reproof and cultivating the charity which he recommends so strongly. It would have been more charitable in him, however, had he forborne to charge us with *wilfully* mitigating facts, our knowledge of which he may assume, but could not be certain of.

We have received a letter from one who signs himself SENEX, which must have been intended for some other publication, as it contains strictures on *a Defence of Duelling*, said to have appeared in our pages.

The communication of L. J. H. is not sufficiently correct for insertion. We should be always glad, in such cases, to have some means of ascertaining the truth of the facts which are related, by a reference to some one on whom we can depend.

We have been obliged considerably to shorten the paper transmitted from Hull by CLERICUS.

We are much obliged to PHILADELPHOS for his remarks on the Monthly Review, but we apprehend that all that is material in them has been already anticipated.

ALLEGORICUS, J. F. H. NAUFRAGUS, GRADUATUS, CONFIRMATURUS, and LUCIUS LONDINENSIS have come to hand.

E. W.'s extract from *Peter's Complaint*; J. P. on the *Evidences of a State of Salvation*; C. L. on *the Passion Week*, E, the Paper on *the most probable Subjects of Divine Grace*, PATROPAS; the letter of A LONDON APPRENTICE; L. J on the opinions respectively held by Calvin and Arminius on the subject of Justification; S. B. and P. R. shall obtain as early an insertion as possible.

We should be glad if M. would give us an opportunity of authenticating his affecting story.

We have considered the letter of AN UNIVERSALIST with care, and we do not think that we have done any injustice to his opinions in our Twelfth Number, p. 813.

The AIR BALLOON, and Y. U. are under consideration.